A HISTORY OF THE DIATRIBE FROM ITS ORIGIN UP TO THE FIRST CENTURY B. C. AND A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE GENRE UPON LUCRETIUS, III, 830-1094

BY

BARBARA PRICE WALLACH

B.A., Mary Washington College, 1968
A.M., University of Illinois, 1970

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Philology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1974

Urbana, Illinois

XUM

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

July, 1974

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS BY

BARBARA PRICE WALLACH

ENTITLED A HISTORY OF THE DIATRIBE FROM ITS ORIGIN UP TO THE FIRST CENTURY B.C. AND A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE GENRE UPON LUCRETIUS, III, 830-1094

BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

M. Marcovich
Director of Thesis Research

M. Marcovich
Head of Department

Committee on Final Examination†

M. Marcovich Chairman
R. P. Oliver
William R Schoedel
Taylor, Daniel J

† Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

D517

PREFACE

I am greatly indebted to Professor Miroslav Marcovich, the thesis advisor and chairman of my doctoral committee, who always was willing to help with any problem, and to the members of my doctoral committee, Professors R. P. Oliver, W. R. Schoedel, and D. J. Taylor.

In addition I owe thanks to my undergraduate advisor, Professor Laura V. Sumner of Mary Washington College, and to all of my teachers at the University of Illinois from whom I have learned a great deal (see Vita).

Special thanks also are due to my husband and former graduate advisor, Prof. Luitpold Wallach, whose seminars in Cicero (1968) and in Horace (1969) taught me the importance of rhetoric and ancient literary criticism for the investigation of Greek and Latin literatures. As I indicate in my Vita and in Chapter V, I plan to continue research and teaching in these areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

I INTRODUCTION. 1

II THE DIATRIBE: THE EARLY HISTORY AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GENRE 13

- A. The Precursors of Bion 20
- B. Bion and Teles. 37
- C. The Three Aristons: Ceos, Chios and Cos 71
- D. Philodemus: Epicureans and the Diatribe 117
- E. Menippus and Varro 189
- F. The Stoics and the Diatribe: Zeno Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and Panaetius 177
- G. Horace: Sermones, II, 3 189
- H. Cicero: Paradoxa Stoicorum 225
- I. The Diatribe and Roman Satire: Ennius and Lucilius 244

III BOOK III, 830-1094: THE DIATRIBE AGAINST THE FEAR OF DEATH 409

IV EPILOGUE 529

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 541

- A. Texts and Commentaries 541
- B. Books and Articles. 546
- C. Supplementary Bibliography 566

VITA 569

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In his article "Lucretius and the History of Satire" (TAPA, 70, 1939; p. 380) Clyde Murley has observed that "Lucretius has been generally disregarded in the account of satire, though incidentally credited with satiric power." One may apply Murley's comment also to rhetoric in Lucretius, for various scholars have disregarded the influence of rhetoric upon the Epicurean poet, although occasionally noticing the clarity or persuasive power of sections of the _De rerum natura._ E. E. Sikes, for example, admits (p. 136) that in book III, ". . .Lucretius, so far from being hampered by 'the rules'. . ." of rhetoric ". . .found them a help to his inspiration." In an earlier section, however, this same scholar has observed that "the indignation of Lucretius is certainly not due to rhetoric, for although he may be rhetorical, he belonged to a generation too early to be corrupted, like Ovid and the Post-Augustans, with the worst features of that blot on Latin poetry. . . ."[1] When he denies that Lucretius' indignation is due to rhetoric, Sikes apparently is using the term "rhetoric" with a pejorative meaning, denoting insincerity, artificiality, and the adoption of a position only _pro forma_, but without true feeling. The adjective "rhetorical," on the other hand, seems to be intended as an admission that the poet did employ various figures, _topoi_, and devices commonly associated with the art of persuasion. A similar attitude toward rhetoric is evinced by W. Y. Sellar, who states concerning Lucretius, "no writer ever used words more clearly or more sincerely: no one shows a greater scorn for the rhetorical artifices which disguise the lack of meaning or insinuate a false conclusion by fine-sounding phrases. . . ." The flaw in the opinions expressed by both Sikes and Sellar is the omission of a definition of "rhetoric" and "rhetorical" and the use of the first of these terms in a manner which does not take into account its positive aspects but obviously stresses only the abuses to which the art was subject. If one follows Aristotle, however, who notes that all men use rhetoric and dialectic in some fashion and who defines rhetoric as ". . .the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion. . . ."[3] then one cannot take the position that rhetoric necessarily disguises one's meaning or "insinuates" conclusions which do not follow from the premises which are presented. Further, even a definition such as the following, provided by the Rhetorica ad Herennium, allows one to assume that both rhetoric and things rhetorical have positive aspects:

> Oratoris officium est de iis rebus posse dicere,
> quae res ad usum civilem moribus et legibus
> constitutae sunt, cum adsensione auditorum,
> quoad eius fieri poterit.[4]

In neither of these definitions is there any reference to insincerity or deception. Further, anyone who mastered the theories of Aristotle and the practical instruction given by the Rhetorica ad Herennium would have acquired tools to help him write and speak effectively, employing figures, of speech and thought, and arguments which, when properly used,

XUM

clarify one's meaning or impress it upon one's listeners. These definitions and this basically positive view of rhetoric as an aid to effective expression will be the basis for the discussion in the following chapters which will show that Lucretius did employ rhetoric in that he observed and selected "the available means of persuasion," which range from straightforward explanations to the emotional use of elements drawn from the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, and in that he was interested in obtaining the "adsensio auditorum" to whom he was expounding Epicurean doctrine.

Any study of rhetoric and the diatribe in Lucretius, of course, faces the problem of the contradiction caused by the assumed Epicurean distrust of rhetoric and the poet's employment of rhetorical elements in his expression of Epicurean doctrine. Concerning Epicurus' own opinions, for example, Quintilian (II, xvii, 17; H. Usener, Epicurea, p. 109) comments, "nam de Epicuro, qui disciplinas omnes fugit, nihil miror. . .," a remark which reminds one of Epicurus' statement (Diogenes Laertius, X, 6; Usener, p. 362) urging a young man to flee from all paideia. The Greek philosopher also is said to have stated that the wise man does not rhetoreusein kalōs (Diogenes Laertius X, 118; Usener, fr. 565, p. 330.)[5] Public speaking and writing, however, do not seem to have been forbidden totally by Epicurus, for he observes that the wise man may dikasesthai, as well as syngrammata katalepsein, although he should not panegyriein.[6] Further, according to Philodemus, Epicurus and his distinguished followers Metrodorus and Hermarchus acknowledged the fact that sophistic or epideictic oratory was an art,[7] thereby revealing, perhaps, an attitude not totally hostile toward rhetoric as a whole. Epicurus' main interest, in regard to forms of expression, in fact, seems to have been in ". . .adequacy of expression and clarity of style (Diog. Laert. 10.13), i.e., virtues of style which were taught by rhetorical theory. . .,"[8] and which seem to indicate that the philosopher's quarrel was not with rhetoric per se, but rather with its abuse. The fact that his Letter to Menoeceus is written in a style which employs various rhetorical devices (cf. Classen, P. 112, note 52 and chapter II, section D of the present study, at footnote 313 ff.) is an additional indication that the founder of Epicureanism saw some value in the art of persuasion, especially for works intended to reach an audience outside of the Epicurean school.[9] Further, as Usener has observed (p. xlii), one should not forget that Epicurus was the pupil of Nausiphanes, ". . .qui quantum curam institutioni oratoriae inpenderit . . .," and that the younger philosopher apparently was well-versed in rhetoric as a result of that association. Thus, it would seem that Epicurus' ". . .alleged hostility towards rhetoric has to be modified . . ." (Classen, op. cit., p. 111) and that one cannot use Epicurean distrust of rhetoric as an excuse for disregarding the influence of that art upon Lucretius, or for claiming that the poet necessarily violated basic Epicurean precepts whenever he employed a device or figure belonging to the rhetorical or diatribal tradition. In addition, as will be noted below (chapter II, section D), the Roman poet's employment of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe with its extremely rhetorical style, need not be considered an un-Epicurean activity, since at least one other Epicurean, Philodemus, also employed the genre, and since Lucretius, like Epicurus in his Letter to Menoeceus, wanted to reach an audience outside of the Epicurean school and therefore chose an effective means of presenting that philosophy in a palatable form.

In his utilization of the "available means of persuasion" Lucretius undoubtedly was influenced by the rhetorical education which he must have received as a boy. The ease with which the poet employs rhetorical figures, *topoi*, and the rhetorical *status* (see Classen, *op. cit.*, p. 107, on the *relatio criminis*) and his apparent familiarity with the type of rhetorical theory contained in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (cf. V, 1-5 and *Rhet. ad Her.*, IV, XLIII. 55) and in Cicero's *De inventione* are strong indications of a study begun early and thoroughly practiced. Further, although one actually knows almost nothing about the life of Lucretius, one can surmise on the basis of the *De rerum natura* that the poet was a well-educated man, conversant in Greek philosophy, in Hellenistic poetry (cf. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius"), and in the work of his Roman predecessors. Lucretius' knowledge of all of these subjects presumably would have begun after he had learned to read and write Latin, and presumably Greek as well, either with the help of a private tutor at home or by attending a school conducted by a *litterator* or *primus magister*.[10] At approximately aged twelve study of ". . .the theory of good speech and the study of the classical poets. . ." (Marrou, *op. cit.*, p. 370) with a *grammaticus* would have been undertaken by the future poet who, like other Roman schoolboys, learned to analyze his native language and studied both the form (i.e., meter and grammar) and content (Marrou, op. cit., pp. 371-376; Clarke, op. cit., p. 14) of such standard poetic works as Livius Andronicus' translation of the Odyssey, and the Annales of Ennius (cf. Gwynn, op. cit., p. 35; Clarke, op cit., p. 18), undoubtedly being required to memorize large portions of both (a fact reflected in the frequent imitations of Ennius within the De rerum natura). Plautus, Terence, Caecilius, and the Roman tragedians also seem to have been "school authors" whom Lucretius must have studied as a boy.

After completing his studies with the grammaticus, at about age fifteen (Clarke, op. cit., p. 12), Lucretius would have begun the study of rhetoric which included "preliminary exercises" known as progymnasmata and progressed from these to actual "practice speeches" (Clark, op. cit., p. 25). The exercises known as progymnasmata seem to have begun with the "re-telling" of fables, followed by exercises in the narration of myths or historical events (cf. Quintilian, II, iv. 2) and the composition of chrias or maxims, which involved the "declension" of a familiar anecdote (cf. Clarke, op. cit., p. 36). These early exercises prepared the student for the next progymnasmata which included ". . .anaskeue and kataskeue, the criticism and defence respectively of the credibility of some incident from mythology or history...," "an exercise which was followed by the development of a commonplace, the composition of encomia, the comparison, the ethopoiia or character sketch, the ekphrasis" . . .or vivid description," the thesis (see Chapter II, at footnote 221 ff.), and, finally, the ". . .commendation of a law supposedly being introduced" (Clarke, op. cit., pp. 36-37; cf. George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, p. 270). Much of this list is based upon information provided by later rhetoricians such as Quintilian, Hermogenes, and Theon, but the conservative nature of Roman education (cf. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 270) and the traces of some of these exercises in the Rhetorica ad Herennium (cf. Georg Reichel, Quaestiones Progymnasticae, pp. 12 ff.) make it likely that this or a similar course of instruction was employed at the time when Lucretius was receiving his rhetorical education from either a Greek or a Roman teacher (cf. Clarke, op. cit., p. 31 and Gwynn, op. cit., pp. 59 ff.). In addition to these exercises the Roman schoolboy learned the basic rules for the arrangement and use of the different divisions of judicial, epideictic, and deliberative speeches (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, I-III; Clarke, op. cit., p. 34) and the various figures of speech and thought (Clarke, op. cit., p. 35). The declamation of controversia, or speeches dealing with imaginary legal disputes, and of suasoria, or a speech giving ". . .advice to a historical character or group of persons at some important point in their career. . ." (Clarke, op. cit., p. 39) completed the student's rhetorical education.

As a result of this educational process, Lucretius, before he ever attempted to write his De rerum natura, was thoroughly versed in metrics, in various rhetorical figures, in theories of style and arrangement, and in the use of devices such as character sketches and anecdotes which can enliven a writer's style if they are not abused. One should not be surprised, then, to find some of these rhetorical elements within the

De rerum natura, since the poet was applying to his poetry those skills which he had learned as a boy by studying the work of other Roman poets (as well as Greek ones) and by writing his own compositions which schooled him in the use of the "available means of persuasion," as well as in "clarity of style" and in the use of appropriate ornamentation.[11] Further, the poet's acquaintance with rhetoric and knowledge of the use of the plain, middle, and grand styles must have helped him to realize the effectiveness of variety (cf. Classen, op. cit., p. 92, on variatio) in obtaining and maintaining the interest of his audience, and, therefore, Lucretius combined with the high epic style of much of his poem the mixed style and devices of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, thereby producing an effective mixture which placed special emphasis upon the Epicurean ethical doctrine which accompanied the poet's explanation of the physical world. Thus, as E. J. Kenney has observed,[12] "by this brilliant combinatory stroke Lucretius not only produced a profoundly original poem; he also laid the foundations of a tradition of satirical writing that has flourished down to modern times."

Unfortunately the influence of rhetoric and the diatribal style in the work of Lucretius never has been thoroughly explored. Kenney, whose introductory remarks in his edition of Lucretius' third book provided a starting impetus for the present study, has given a general survey of the diatribal style (pp. 17-18) and had indicated the probable effects of the Cynic-Stoic genre upon Lucretius (pp. 19-20 and passim in his commentary; cf. chapter III of the present study). Prior to Kenney, André Oltramare, whose work on the Roman diatribe still is extremely valuable,[13] dealt with the diatribe in Lucretius, although, as Kenney notes (*op cit*., p. 19, note 1), his treatment of that poet ". . .is unfortunately inadequate. . . ." Oltramare's pioneering efforts have been followed by Paul Vallette's brief article on "Lucrèce et la Diatribe" (*Revue des Études Anciennes* 42 (1940), 532-41), Bruno Lavagnini's "Motivi Diatribici in Lucrezio e in Giovenale" (*Athenaeum,* N.S. 25 (1947), 83-88), and two penetrating articles by Gian-Biagio Conte, "‛ΤΨΟΣ e Diatriba nello Stile di Lucrezio (De Rer. Nat. 1-61)" (*Maia* 18 (1966), 338-368), and "Il 'Trionfo della Morte' e la Galleria dei Grandi Trapassati in Lucrezio III 1024-1053" (*Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 37 (1965), 114-132). With the exception of Conte and Kenney, however, no one has conducted a reasonably thorough investigation of the influence of the diatribal style upon large portions of the *De rerum natura*. The study of rhetoric in Lucretius also had been largely neglected[14] before C. Joachim Classen's important study "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius" (TAPA 99 (1968), 77-118), whose analysis has been influential upon the present study, and the recent penetrating book *Horror ac Divina Voluptas, Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce* (Amsterdam, 1970) by P. H. Schrijvers. The work of both of these scholars is a beginning, but much more remains to be done in the area of rhetoric in Lucretius.

The study of the diatribe in Lucretius, and indeed in any other ancient writer, however, is hampered by the lack of a thorough survey of the early development of the genre and of its influence on literature prior to Lucretius. Chapter II of the present study, therefore, will present a history of the diatribe up to the first century B. C. and will show the use of the genre by members of various philosophical schools and the possible influence of the genre upon selected literary figures. Relying upon the characteristics of the genre delineated by Chapter II, the third chapter will discuss the influence of rhetoric and of the diatribal style upon the conclusion of the third book of the De rerum natura. Chapter IV, finally, will present the conclusions which can be drawn from this study.

Footnotes

1. E. E. Sikes, Lucretius, Poet and Philosopher (Cambridge, 1936), p. 30. Cf. P. H. Schrijvers, Horror ac Divina Voluptas, Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce (Amsterdam, 1970), p. 9, quotes both of these passages from Sikes.

   Sikes fails to take into account the rhetorical nature of much of the Alexandrian literature which influenced Roman poetry. Cf., for example, Theocritus, XVII and chapter III of this study.

2. W. Y. Sellar, The Roman Poets of the Republic (Oxford, 3rd. ed., 1905), p. 290. Schrijvers, op. cit., p. 9, also quotes this passage from Sellers and notes the use of the term rhetoric "au sens péjoratif."

3. Ars Rhetorica 1354a (on rhetoric and dialectic) and 1355b25 (on the definition of rhetoric as dunamis peri hekaston tou theoresai to endechomenon pithanon). I have quoted the translation by W. Rhys Roberts (New York, rep. 1954 with an introduction by Fredrich Solmsen).

4. I, ii.2, ed Fredrich Marx, ed. ster. cor. Winfried Trillitzsch (Teubner, 1964).

5. C. Joachim Classen, "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius," TAPA 99 (1968) 111 quotes this remark by Epicurus. I have followed Classen's arrangement in my discussion of Epicurus and rhetoric.

6. Cf. Harry M. Hubbell, " Isocrates and the Epicureans," CP 11 (1916), 418 who quotes these remarks from Diogenes Laertius, X, 121 (Usener, pp. 330 and 332, fr. 563, 566, and 576).

7. Cf. Harry M. Hubbell, The Rhetorica of Philodemus, Translation and Commentary (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 23, 1920), pp. 256 and 567 (cited hereafter as Hubbell, Rhetorica). See also Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica, ed. Siegfried Sudhaus (3 vols., Teubner, 1893), vol. 3 (Supplement), p. 8, col. VII; Cicero, Academica Posteriora I, 5, who observes that the Epicureans Amafinius and Rabirius ". . .nullam denique artem esse nec dicendi nec disserendi putant." On the Ciceronian remarks, cf. Classen, op. cit., p. 113.

8. Classen, op. cit., p. 111.

XUM

9. Usener, op. cit., p. xlii, observes "nempe multos hodieque latet, quantum discrimen inter duo sermonis pedestris genera intercedat, quae ex Aristotelis tempore a scriptoribus graecis non paucis simul coli videmus: eos dico libros quos publice edebant ut ab hominibus elegantioribus legerentur, et eos quos sibi suisque philosophi maxime scribebant, quos ὑπομνήματα Graeci, Romani commentarios dixerunt." Cf. J. F. D'Alton, *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism, A Study in Tendencies* (London, 1939), pp. 159-160 on the Epicurean attitude toward rhetoric and especially p. 160 where he observes concerning Epicurus, "in his own style he aimed especially at perspicuity, and made no prètence of elegance or ornateness, though Theon [Progym. II, 71; Usener, p. 89] charged him with straining at time after rhythmical effects such as were affected by Hegesias and the Asianist orators."

10. Cf. H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, tr. George Lamb (New York, Mentor Books edition, 1964), pp. 358-368; see also Aubrey Gwynn, *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian* (Oxford, 1926), pp. 29 ff. on the origins of schools at Rome; M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London, 1971), p. 11.

    See also Clarke, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15 on the bilingual nature of the Roman culture. Lucretius could have learned Greek at a very early age, before his formal schooling had even begun.

11. Cf. M. L. Clarke, "Rhetorical Influences in the Aeneid," *Greece and Rome* 18 (1949) 15 ff. on ". . .the sort of way in which rhetoric can influence poetry. . . ."

12. Ed. Lucretius, *De rerum natura Book III* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge, 1971), p. 15. See also *ibid*., pp. 14-16 on the use of the didactic *epos* and the three forms of style.

13. André Oltramare, *Les Origines de la Diatribe Romaine* (lausanne, 1926).

14. The exceptions are J. Woltjer, "Studia Lucretiana," *Mnemosyne* N.S. 24 (1896), 66-68 (cited by Classen, *op. cit*., p. 106) and E. K. Rand," La composition rhétorique du troisieme livre de Lucrèce," *Revue de Philologie* ser. 3, 8 (1934) 243-66. Kenney's bibliography (*op. cit*., p. 246) and footnotes have been a very helpful source of information concerning studies in rhetoric and diatribe in Lucretius.

XUM

CHAPTER II

THE DIATRIBE: THE EARLY HISTORY AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GENRE

In his study Morphologie der Antiken Literatur, Helmut Rahn briefly mentions "die in der griechischen Welt verbreiteste Form, in der der griechische Wesenszug des φιλοσοφεῖν ausserhalb der eigentlichen Philosophenschulen in der philosophischen Prosa zum Ausdruck kam...," that is "das gemeinsame Zusammensitzen und Diskutieren ohne erkennbaren praktischen Nutzen, lediglich um sich seine Gedanken über etwas zu machen und sie auszutauschen, sich im Besserwissen zu überbieten, sich dabei zu ärgern, zu necken und mit Komplimenten zu kosen - kurz, gemeinsamer Zeitvertreib mit Unterhaltung (das συνδιατρίβειν).[1] The similarity of the practice here described to scenes found in Platonic dialogues is obvious and perhaps reflects an early meaning of the term διατριβή, with which συνδιατρίβειν is obviously connected and which referred to a philosophical school or to "the activity of the master in his school," although Rahn's comments refer to discussions outside of any such organization.[2] Along with the development of philosophical schools such as the Cynic, Stoic and Epicurean, which were eager to convey their ethical doctrines to a large number of people went a change in the method of presenting philosophy and perhaps a change in the meaning of the term diatribē, which seems to have been extended to include the "new" method of philosophical exposition, the public exhortation to virtue.[3] The transition from such intimate philosophical discussions to public exhortations is not too difficult to imagine, especially if one considers the eagerness of some philosophical schools to spread their doctrines, and the recognition by them of the fact that their teachings would

XUM

not be understood by the average citizen if they were presented in a "style suited to the intelligentsia of Athens...".[4] As D. R. Dudley notes, "Diogenes [the Cynic] himself discovered that 'when he spoke in earnest on serious subjects, none stayed to hear him, but when he began to whistle, a crowd soon gathered'."[5] The form of exhortation that came to be known as the diatribe, of course, involved more than whistling or other such antics, but it was developed to accommodate the changing needs of philosophies or perhaps, more specifically, those of philosophers who wished to keep their listeners' attention long enough to convey a message. It is the purpose of this chapter to study the development of such exhortations, to define the genre of diatribe, and, finally, to examine the stylistic characteristics of the diatribe which contributed to its effectiveness and influence.

The best definition of the term "diatribe," first of all, is that expressed by Hermann Throm,who states (Die Thesis in Rhetorische Studien, 17, Paderborn, 1932; p. 191) that diatribes ". . .nicht anderes als ethische, besonders paränetische Theseis sind. . ." Such a definition captures the essentially hybrid nature of the genre, for theses were "subjects of a general nature involving principles, but not specific facts. . ." (G. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece; p. 20) which originally were discussed within philosophical schools, but which gradually were taken over by the rhetoricians as well (see below at footnote 225 ff.). Since the diatribe seems to have been a lecture in which a general moral question was developed in a rhetorical fashion, one may describe it as an early example of the combination of rhetoric and philosophy which took place as the rhetoricians began to draw upon philosophical topics as a source for their exercises in declamation (see below at footnote 225 ff.).

XUM

The particular type of thesis which one may call a diatribe can be further defined as a "subliterary genre, one of a number of such genres of a generally homitelic type,"[6] which is "an example of a mixture of genres in prose--through including also verse quotations--. . ., a motley compilation of elements derived from the philosophical treatise, the oration, the school lecture and the dialogue," probably first given form by Bion of Borysthenes in the third century B.C.[7] The characteristics of this mixed genre are listed by Paul Wendland in his study Philo und die Kynisch-Stoische Diatribe (Berlin, 1895; p. 1), by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in Die Griechische Literatur des Altertums (Berlin, 1907; p. 100), and by Rudolf Bultmann in his famous study of the influence of the diatribe upon Paul (see footnote 8). They include a form of delivery into which dialogue can be introduced, through the use of personification, through the assumption of an immaginary adversary who must be answered, or through a direct address to the listener (cf. Bultmann, p. 13). Further, the diatribe tends to have a polemical tone, in that it attacks the vices and follies of mankind, although one should add here that this tone often is varied with a didactic or less-biting homiletic one and sometimes is a part of the mixture of seriousness and humor (see below at footnote 41) which is a means of maintaining the audience's attention and a less painful form of attack. To these major traits of the genre must be added the use of parataxis and of rather short sentences (cf. E. Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa, I, p. 129), and the employment of various popular devices such as the quotation or parodying of verse, the recounting of anecdotes, apothegms, and fables, the employment of witty remarks and antitheses, the application of pertinent comparisons, and, finally, the ornamentation of the whole with rhetorical figures and devices which will appeal to the general listener. One also may add here the comment of Oswyn Murray, who observes that "the elements of the diatribe" are "short ethical discussions on a theme rhetorically developed and provided with numerous examples" which "could easily be combined to form longer treatises on a general topic."[8] These "ethical discussions" deal with topics that are commonplace and concerned with the proper conduct of one's life.

As one may have noticed, the composite definition of diatribe given above is composed only of comments made by modern scholars. Unfortunately, one encounters great difficulties if one tries to find an ancient definition of the genre, since the term "diatribe" used in reference to any type of rhetorical genre is "ein Titel der übrigens erst seit nachchristlicher Zeit bezeugt ist...," according to M. Puelma Piwonka (*Lucilius und Kallimachus*, Frankfurt am Main, 1949; p. 203). Puelma Piwonka's statement might seem to be too sweeping in view of the reference to the "διατριβαῖ" of the sophists made by Philodemus in his *Rhetorica* (col. XIII, 35, ed. S. Sudhaus, vol. I, Teubner, 1892) and the following observation found in his *De ira* (col. XXXV, 27-31, ed. C. Wilke, Teubner, 1914):

> ἔλεγχος ἀκριβὴς ἐν τε|γραφαῖς καὶ διᾰτριβαῖς|
> τῶν κατὰ τοὺς λ[ό]γους δι|απεπτωκότων φιλο|σόφων....[9]

In neither case, however, can one assume that the diatribes in question were anything other than discussions, since no definition of the term is given. Further, the writer most commonly cited as a source for an ancient definition of "diatribe" is Hermogenes, whose definition leaves much to be desired.[10] According to Hermogenes, "διατριβή ἐστι βραχέος διανοήματος ἠθικοῦ ἔκτασις, ἵνα ἐμμείνῃ τὸ ἦθος τοῦ λέγοντος ἐν τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ ἀκούοντος, οἷον 'τὴν μὲν ὕβριν Μειδίου πάντες ἴστε', ἐξέτεινε δ'αὐτὸ οὕτως<<τὴν μὲν ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὴν ὕβριν, ᾗ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀεὶ χρῆται Μειδίας, οὐδένα οὔθ' ὑμῶν οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν ἀγνοεῖν οἴομαι>>· καὶ τὸ Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου προοίμιον ὁμοίως ἔχει."[11] Hermogenes' definition, at first glance, seems at least to indicate the element of "short ethical discussions" found in the diatribe, but obviously tells one little about the genre itself, so little, in fact, that one is tempted to assume that by "διατριβή" Hermogenes means something quite different from the genre of diatribe under discussion in this chapter. For example, Hermogenes here seems to imply that the speaker primarily wants to convey an *ethos*, i.e., in rhetorical terminology, a character delineation,[12] perhaps of someone else, but here apparently of the speaker. Such character delineation, as will be seen later, can be a part of the diatribe, and can contribute to conveying its philosophical message, but certainly is not the main characteristic of the genre. The example given by Hermogenes, further, is too brief to be descriptive of a whole genre and seems to be similar, although not identical, with the rhetorical device known to the Romans as *expolitio* which occurs "cum in eodem loco manemus et aliud atque aliud dicere videmur. Ea dupliciter fit: si aut eandem plane dicemus rem, aut de eadem re."[13] Such an interpretation of *diatribē* in Hermogenes is strengthened when one examines the example to which he himself refers, the *prooemium* of the *Peri tou stephanou* of Demosthenes. In the eight sections which form the *prooemium* of this speech Demosthenes states, develops, and then restates his plea for a fair hearing in which his judges will be inspired by the gods to follow the law.[14] Demosthenes not only "refines" and repeats his theme in these lines, but he also attempts to give his judges a good impression of his own character, an example of what Hermogenes must mean by "τὸ ἦθος τοῦ λέγοντος." What this section of Demosthenes' speech definitely is *not*, is a diatribe as defined earlier in this chapter. One can only conclude, then, that Hermogenes' definition of *diatribē* does not refer to the rhetorical genre under consideration but rather refers to some specific figure which can be included in a chapter headed, as this one is in Hermogenes, by the words περὶ περιττότητος," on redundancy."[15]

There is no other ancient definition of *diatribē* which can be cited to show the use of the term to denote a rhetorical genre. Several occurrences of the word, however, are worth noting here. First of all, as has been mentioned before (see footnote 2), *diatribē* sometimes was used to refer to a philosophical school or to the activity of its master.[16] This same usage is reflected in Aulus Gellius, a contemporary of Hermogenes, in the phrase "Quidam dialecticus ex Platonis diatriba."[17] Further, Athenaeus, writing a few years later, mentions the work "κατὰ τῆς Πλάτωνος διατριβῆς" written by the historian Theopompus of Chios, showing an early usage of the term as "school" and Athenaeus' own understanding of it as such.[18] In this same section Athenaeus also gives a quotation from Theopompus' work in which the historian claims that the dialogues of Plato "ἀλλοτρίους δὲ τοὺς πλεῖους," coming from the "διατριβῶν" of Antisthenes, Aristippus, and Bryson.[19] A translation of "διατριβῶν" as "schools" seems incorrect here, and one must assume that the term refers to some activity undertaken by these three men. Possible clues to the correct translation are found in Diogenes Laertius, who mentions dialogues and writings "ἐν τῇ Ἀληθείᾳ καὶ τοῖς Προτρεπτικοῖς" composed by Antisthenes in a rhetorical style,[20] and who also notes that some say that Aristippus wrote six books of "διατριβῶν."[21] If one assumes that some works by Antisthenes must also be diatribai, if he is to be grouped with Aristippus by Theopompus, then one must assume that a diatribē is something other than a dialogue and perhaps is some sort of philosophical essay. Perhaps, then, with Aristippus, Antisthenes, and Bryson came the development of a kind of philosophical essay or lecture which was given the name diatribē. Further, since the term has the meaning "conversation" in several passages of Plato's works,[22] the diatribai of these three philosophers may have been conversational in style, despite their apparent lack of dialogue, and certainly were not the short collections of sayings or hypomnemata which Susemihl thinks they were.[23] The fact that Diogenes Laertius also refers to the works of Bion as diatribai perhaps lends credence to the supposition that the works of Aristippus, Antesthenes, and Bryson were something similar to the "discussions" of Bion.[24] One must be very cautious, however, in assuming that the works of Bion were called diatribai since the term is not attested for him in any reference earlier than that of Diogenes Laertius.

If one considers the citations from Gellius, Athenaeus, Theopompus, and Diogenes Laertius, one is left with the impression that evidence for ancient use of the term diatribē to refer to an established rhetorical genre is rather slim. The term certainly was applied to some works of Antisthenes, Aristippus, and Bryson by the historian Theopompus, but one cannot be certain that those works were at all similar to the type of writing later developed by Bion of Borysthenes or even that the works of Bion were also called diatribai. Further, no ancient description of a genre called the diatribē exists, and one must study the remnants of Bion and his pupil Teles, as modern scholars have done,[25] in order to recreate a genre composed of rhetorical moral essays or lectures. There is, of course, the possibility that there was no such ancient genre and that the characterisation of works as diatribes is a recent invention. In fact, one modern scholar, Helmut Rahn, seems to think that this is the case, and he writes, "Morphologish ist die literarische Erscheinung „ der Diatribe" als literaturwissenschaftlicher Begriff schwer fassbar und unergiebig; denn über den von uns betrachteten gesellschaftlichen Rahmen hinaus ergibt sie keine einheitliche Literaturform. Sie verbindet sich nur mit anderen literarischen Formen als etwas erlebnishaft „ Diatribenartiges"."[26] Rahn's judgement is perhaps too severe, since one must admit, at least, that lectures or essays on ethical subjects were written or delivered orally by Bion and others and that some themes and stylistic traits from these works were influential on literary genres.[27] As has been shown in this chapter, however, the name to be applied to these essays or lectures is in doubt. The present writer, therefore, uses the term "diatribe" with reservations and with the understanding that it may be a name adopted by modern literary critics because of its use by Diogenes Laertius to refer to the works of Bion.

A. The Precursors of Bion

The development of the genre known as diatribe is slightly easier to trace than is the origin of its name. Eduard Norden thinks that the diatribe, which he describes as a declamation, developed from the dialogue "dass der sie vortragende Deklamator an die Stelle der beiden im Dialog sprechenden Personen sich selbst und eine fingierte Person setzte, mit der er nun die λογομαχία ausficht: die Diatribe ist also nichts anderes als ein in die Form der Deklamation umgewandelter Dialog."[28] If one considers the spurious dialogues of Plato, such as the Clitophon and the Alcibiades II, in which conversations are held between "Socrate et un anonyme,"[29] one can see that

Norden may be correct in assuming that there was a gradual change in the dialogue which led to the appearance of the anonymous opponent who often is mentioned in diatribes. W. Capelle, however, argues that the diatribe could not have developed from the dialogue, which, as he notes, was a form used "für die tiefdringendsten philosophischen Untersuchungen," and explains away the "anonymous opponent" by saying that it is a device which was used by the early rhetoricians, that is especially by Gorgias and his followers, and which then was taken over by Greek prose writers.[30] Capelle's argument is a valid one, especially since the extant fragments of the diatribe show that the genre was very rhetorical in nature, and therefore probably also in origin. Further, if the information found in the quotation from Theopompus, which was cited above, can be trusted, then some early form of diatribe may be contemporary with the dialogues of Plato and therefore derivation of the diatribe from the dialogue is unlikely.[31] One must not discount the possibility, however, that later writers of diatribes, such as Bion, could have been influenced by the dialogues of Plato or even by the dialogues which are said to have been written by Antisthenes. In addition to any influence from the dialogue or from the rhetorical schools the diatribe also may have been affected by the mime or by Attic middle or new comedy, although one also must allow for the possibility that these forms in turn may have drawn upon diatribes or other philosophical works for some of their themes.[32]

The final product of all these influences, the diatribe, developed because of a specific need for "eine Philosophie für jedermann'" which could be understood and adopted as a guide for life in an era in which many political changes had taken place.[33] Ethics, therefore, became the main concern of philosophy, providing "the individual's guide of life which he could substitute for mere obedience to his city's laws."[34] Cynic, Cyrenaic, Epicurean, and Stoic philosophers all attempted to provide their own definitions of ethical conduct and to win converts to their views through public exhortations or extensive written literature, with the result that the Cynics and Stoics especially "acquired the reputation of being primarily preachers against evil," even though they also stressed a positive program.[35] Antisthenes, Aristippus, and Bryson, three early representatives of the trend toward the study of ethics, which probably goes back to Socrates, already have been mentioned, and the problem of what was meant by the term διατριβή when applied to their work has been discussed. After these three, the first person known to have begun publicly censuring vice and expounding his own idea of virtue is Diogenes of Sinope, with whom the Cynic school really began and whose austere and eccentric way of life is too well-known to need comment here.[36] One should mention, however, that, according to Diogenes Laertius, Diogenes of Sinope claimed that παρρησία or "freedom of speech" was the κάλλιστον ἐν ἀνθρώροις,[37] a belief which he supported by his own way of life and which was upheld by later Cynics, finding expression in their diatribes and other works. After Diogenes came his pupil Crates, who also followed the austere way of life of his teacher and who has special importance in that he was the teacher of Zeno of Citium, who later founded the Stoic school, and of Bion of Borysthenes, who is creditied with developing the public exhortations of the Cynics into the genre now known as the diatribe.[38] Crates, according to Diogenes Laertius, VI. 86, was known as "Θυρεπανοίκτης διὰ τὸ εἰς πᾶσαν εἰσιέναι οἰκίαν καὶ νουθετεῖν," and expressed his practical wisdom in verses such as the following (Diogenes Laertius, VI. 86):

"ταυτ' ἔχω ὅσσ' ἔμαθον καὶ ἐφρόντισα καὶ μετὰ Μουσῶν
σέμν' ἐδάην· τὰ δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ὄλβια τῦφος ἔμαρψεν."[39]

In some of his poetry appears what came to be known as τὸ σπουδαιογέλοιον, the "favorite Cynic mixture of seriousness and humor,"[40] which allows the writer to censure moral faults, "not with bitterness, but with kindliness, wishing to aid..." his listeners.[41] Diogenes Laertius, VI. 86, mentions the following lines which provide a sample of this tone:

"ἔρωτα παύει λιμός, εἰ δὲ μή, χρόνος·
ἐὰν δὲ τούτοις μὴ δύνῃ χρῆσθαι, βρόχος."

As a further instance of wisdom and humor one should note the statement of Diogenes Laertius, VI. 89, according to whom Crates "ἔλεγέ τ' ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἀδιάπτωτον εὑρεῖν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν ῥοιᾷ καὶ σαπρόν τινα κόκκον εἶναι," using the simple type of comparison often found in the later diatribe.[42]

Teles, a later Cynic,preserves a twenty-seven line passage in prose[43] which should be considered here along with the verse fragments of Crates, since it features several traits which later occur in the work of his student Bion. There is nothing in Teles to indicate whether this passage formed a brief lecture given by the Cynic or whether it was part of a larger work. As it now exists, the passage is a minature lecture which begins "Εἰ δὲ δεῖ τὸν εὐδαίμονα βίον ἐκ τῶν πλεοναζουσῶν ἡδονῶν συγκρῖναι, οὐδείς, φησὶν ὁ Κράτης, εὐδαίμων γεγονὼς ἂν εἴη...," and then ends with the comments "οὐχ ὁρῶ οὖν, πῶς εὐδαίμονά τις βίον ἔσται βεβιωκώς, εἴπερ δεῖ τῷ πλεονασμῷ τῶν ἡδονῶν ἐκμετρῆσαι," an excellent example of ring composition which probably is the work of the author but which may be the result of editing by Teles.[44] The theme, as one can tell from the lines just quoted, is the problem of how one can be happy since "...εἰ θέλει τις ἐκλογίσασθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ βίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡλικίας, εὑρήσει πολλῷ πλείους τὰς ἀλγηδόνας." There follows a

XUM

humorous description of the miseries inherent in each stage of life, from infancy to old age, and an especially important section in which Crates notes that one who has reached manhood "μακαρίζει ἐκεῖνον τὸν βίον, ὅν παῖς ὢν ἐβίωσε," possibly showing the theme of discontent with one's lot which appears in the work of Bion.[45] In the development of these topics the most notable element is simplicity, of style and of content, as one would expect in a work of popular philosophy. The apparent simplicity of style is deceiving, however, for many rhetorical devices are used, perhaps to emphasize a point or else merely to capture the attention of the audience. The most obvious figure is asyndeton or the lack of connection between word groups or clauses.[46] For example, when he speaks about the fate of a child as it grows up, Crates says (Teles, p. 50. 3-4), "εἰ δ' ἐκπέφευγε τὴν τιτθήν, παρέλαβε πάλιν ὁ παιδαγωγός, παιδοτρίβης, γραμματοδιδάσκαλος, ἁρμονικός, ζωγράφος." The abruptness caused by the asyndeton seems to emphasize the child's weariness as he is taken from teacher to teacher, while the alliteration of "π" adds to the effect. As another instance of asyndeton, in this case augmented by anaphora in the repetition of τὸν, one may consider the following line which has an effect similar to that of the one cited above:

> "ἔμπαλιν τὸν κοσμητὴν φοβεῖται, τὸν παιδοτρίβην, τὸν ὁπλομάχον, τὸν γυμνασίαρχον." (Teles, pp. 50. 7-8)[47]

Polysyndeton, the opposite of asyndeton, also appears once, in the sentence (Teles, p. 50. 10), "...ἔτι φοβεῖται καὶ παρατηρεῖ καὶ γυμνασίαρχον καὶ στρατηγόν."

Two other effective rhetorical devices are homoeoptoton and homoeoteleuton, since they tend to catch the listener's attention and also to make him remember what he hears. For a clear definition of these two terms one must rely on Quintilian and on Demetrius, the author of the περὶ ἑρμηνείας. Demetrius, first of all, states (I, 26) that homoeoteleuta "...ἐστὶ τὰ εἰς ὅμοια καταλήγοντα, ἤτοι εἰς ὀνόματα ταὐτά, ὥσπερ ἔχει ἐπὶ τοῦ 'σὺ δ'αὐτὸν καὶ ζῶντα ἔλεγες κακῶς, καὶ νῦν ἀποθανόντα γράφεις κακῶς' · ἢ ὅταν εἰς ουλλαβὴν καταλήγῃ τὴν αὐτήν...", as in the sentence (from Isocrates' Panegyricus, 1) "'πολλάκις εθαύμασα τῶν τὰς πανηγύρεις συναγαγόντων καὶ τοὺς γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας καταστησάντων.'" Quintilian's definition (IX, iii. 77) is similar, describing the figure homoeoteleuton as "...similem duarum sententiarum vel plurium finem...," and providing the examples "Non modo ad salutem eius exstinguendam sed etiam gloriam per tales viros infringendam" and "vicit pudorem libido, timorem audacia, rationem amentia" (an example which Quintilian also designates as a τρίκωλα). Further, according to the Roman rhetorician, "fit etiam singulis verbis: Hecuba hoc dolet, pudet, piget..." (IX, iii, 77). Quintilian also provides a definition of homoeoptoton (IX, iii, 78) as a figure involving similar, but not necessarily identical cases, which "nec tantum in fine deprehenditur, sed respondentibus vel primis inter se vel mediis vel extremis vel etiam permutatis his, ut media primis et summa mediis accommodentur, et quocunque modo accommodari potest." As an example appears the sentence (IX, iii, 79) "...amisso nuper infelicis aulae si non praesidio inter pericula tamen solacio inter adversa....," concerning which the author comments on the correspondence between praesidio and solacio, and pericula and adversa. One final example given by Quintilian and worthy of note here as containing the figures isocolon, homoeoptoton, and homoeoteleuton is the sentence (IX, iii, 80) ", non minus nunc in causa cederet Aulus Caecina Sexti Aebutii impudentiae, quam tum in vi facienda cessit audaciae....". The more prevalent the two figures homoeoptoton and homoeoteleuton in this passage of Crates is the second which occurs in lines such as the following (Teles, p. 50.2):

> διψᾷ, ἡ δὲ λούει·κοιμηθῆναι θέλει, ἡ δὲ κρόταλον
> ἔχουσα ψοφεῖ.

Another example, which fits into Quintilian's category of homoeoteleuton with single words, is the sentence (Teles, p. 50. 13-14) "στρατεύεται καὶ πρεσβεύει υπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, πολιτεύεται, στρατηγεῖ, χορηγεῖ, ἀγωνοθετεῖ...," in which the repetition of sounds stresses the monotony of the experiences.[49] Homoeoptoton also appears, as, for instance, in the comment (Teles, p. 49. 2-6) "ἀλλ' εἰ θέλει τις ἐκλογίσασθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ βίῳ πάσας τὰς ἡλικίας, εὑρήσει πολλῷ πλείους τὰς ἀλγηδόνας....," in which homoeoteleuton is used as well. Another type of repetition worth noticing here is the use of a verb first as an infinitive and then as a third person plural in the same sentence, which is illustrated by the following group of three sentences and which again emphasizes the monotony of the theme (Teles, p. 50. 11 ff.):

> "παρακοιτεῖν εἴπου δεῖ, οὗτοι παρακοιτοῦσι·φυλάττειν
> καὶ ἀγρυπνεῖν, οὗτοι φυλάττουσιν· εἰς τὰ πλοῖα
> ἐβαίνειν, οὗτοι ἐμβαίνουσιν."

The most striking aspect of the style of Crates, however, is not the use of any of the figures mentioned, but rather is the brevity of his sentences and his tendency to use *isocola*, or clauses having an equal or nearly equal number of syllables.[50] In the example just quoted above (Teles, p. 50. 11ff.) one sees three short sentences in each of which the first clause has seven syllables and is followed by a second clause containing six or seven syllables. The comment "ἐξ ἐφήβων ἐστὶ καὶ ἤδη εἴκοσι ἐτῶν·..."

(Teles, p. 50. 9 ff.) is a similar instance. Crates also sometimes varies his style in this passage by alternating slightly longer sentences with extremely short ones, as the following passage shows (Teles, p. 50. 5-8):

> "προάγει ἡλικία·προσγίνεται ἀριθμητικός, γεωμέτρης,
> πωλοδάμνης, [ὑπὸ τούτων πάντων μαστιγοῦται]·
> ὄρθρου ἐγείρεται· σχολάσαι οὐκ ἔστιν·ἔφηβος γέγονεν·
> ἔμπαλιν τὸν κοσμητὴν φοβεῖται, τὸν παιδοτρίβην,τὸν
> ὁπλομάχον, τὸν γυμνασίαρχον."

Dialogue, which would have been an important means of variation, however, is missing,but one cannot assume on that basis alone that Crates never wrote anything in which dialogue was used. The whole passage is far more effective without dialogue to interrupt the general feeling of monotony and discontent and, therefore, rightly is avoided.

One final element of the Cynic's style should be noted. As he concludes his statements on the longing of an old man for his lost youth (Teles, p. 50. 15 ff), Crates inserts the following verse quotation, taken from Euripides (Herc., 637 ff.):

> "ἡ νεότης μοι φίλον, τὸ δὲ γῆρας
> βαρύτερον Αἴτνης." (Teles, p. 51. 1-2).

The quoting of verse to illustrate or strengthen a point is a common occurrence in the work of Bion and Teles,[51] but since the fragments of Crates are so few, one cannot prove that such citations are common in his prose. Some fragments of his tragedies do show that Crates occasionally imitated lines from other tragedies, as the following lines, preserved by Diogenes Laertius, VI, 98 (as lines from a tragedy by Crates), will illustrate:

"οὐχ εἷς πάτρας μοι πύργος, οὐ μία στέγη,
πάσης δὲ χέρσου καὶ πόλισμα καὶ δόμος
ἕτοιμος ἡμῖν ἐνδιαιτᾶσθαι πάρα."

One should compare with this fragment the two anonymous lines, found in Plutarch, in which Heracles says,

"Ἀργεῖος ἢ Θηβαῖος· οὐ γὰρ εὔχομαι
μιᾶς· ἅπας μοι πύργος Ἑλλήνων πατρίς."[52]

Similar imitations and perhaps also parodies may have appeared in Crates' prose, but one cannot, of course, be certain that they did.

The question of whether this twenty-seven line passage is complete in itself still remains to be solved. The abundance of ornamentation and the use of ring composition show that at least it was carefully planned and written. One might assume, however, that the answer to the problem noted by Crates here would have been answered in a following section which stressed the importance of independence and the ascetic life which could remove one from monotony.[53] If such a section or sections did exist, then Crates possibly should be considered the true creator of the diatribe form which his student Bion later developed, although, because of the lack of evidence, one cannot state definitely that Crates ever wrote anything in prose of greater length than this passage.[54]

Before one proceeds from this discussion of Crates to a study of his pupils, one other philosopher, Stilpon of Megara, a contemporary of Crates and follower of the Megarean Eucleides,[55] must be dealt with as another possibly important figure in the final development of the diatribe. Stilpon apparently was either an effective teacher or a good speaker since Diogenes Laertius (II, 113) says concerning him ",τοσοῦτον δ'εὑρεσιλογίᾳ καὶ σοφιστείᾳ προῆγε τοῦς ἄλλους, ὥστε μικροῦ δεῆσαι πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφορῶσαν εἰς αὐτὸν μεγαρίσαι." Among those whom he attracted were Zeno of Citium, who became his student (Diogenes Laertius, II, 114 and 120), and the Cynic Crates, who, annoyed by a comment concerning his way of life, is said to have replied in the following lines (Diogenes Laertius, II, 114 and 118):

> "καὶ μὴν Στίλπων' εἰσεῖδον χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἔχοντα
> ἐν Μεγάροις, ὅθι φασὶ Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς·
> ἔνθα τ' ἐρίζεσκεν, πολλοὶ δ' ἀμφ' αὐτὸν ἑταίροι·
> τὴν δ' ἀρετὴν παρᾶ γράμμα διώκοντες κατέτριβον."[56]

This description probably is correct, despite the humor involved, since the Megarean philosopher was well-known for his arguments and once embarrassed the famous dialectician Diodorus Cronus with "...λόγους τινὰς διαλεκτικοὺς...."[57] In addition to his dialectical skill, Stilpon seems to have had some talent for dealing with people, if Diogenes Laertius (II, 117) is correct in reporting, "ἦν δ' ὁ Στίλπων καὶ ἀφελῆς καὶ ἀνεπίπλαστος πρός τε τὸν ἰδιώτην εὔθετος."

The aspect of Stilpon's work most important in tracing the history of the diatribe is the fact that he is known to have written dialogues which Diogenes Laertius (II, 120) describes as "ψυχροί," presumably referring to their style. A nineteen line section of one of these apparently is preserved in the diatribe Περὶ φυγῆς composed by Teles (p. 21. 6 ff.) and has provoked some debate over the question of the source of the quotation.[58] Further one cannot be sure that these nineteen lines all come from Stilpon or that Teles has not added a few comments of his own to round them off. Wilamowitz correctly notes "allein es muss zugestanden werden, dass Teles seine eigene rede und die seiner quelle, eines stilponischen dialoges, in unentwirrbarer weise vermischt hat. doch es genügt, auf seine durchgehende manier zu verweisen; hat er es doch in demselben vortrage 69, 13 mit Bion grade so gemacht, und bei diesem, seinem lieblingsschriftsteller, kehrt es noch öfter wieder."[59] If one assumes that Stilpon used ring composition in the section of his work from which these lines are taken, however, then the almost exact similarity of the phrase "...τίνων ἡ φυγὴ <ἢ> ποίων ἀγαθῶν στερίσκει...," found in the second line of the quotation, to "ποίων οὖν ἀγαθῶν ἡ φυγὴ στερίσκει...," found in lines sixteen and seventeen, would seem to indicate that at least sixteen lines are carefully tied together. The next two lines conceivably could be attached with the understanding that the "ὁρῶ" of the eighteenth line refers to Stilpon, while the plural φασίν of the twentieth line marks the change of source and does not belong in the quotation from Stilpon.[60] Further, the use of isocola and homoeoteleuton in the nineteenth line might be advanced as a reason for including it in the quotation which, as will be shown presently, also makes use of these figures. One should note, however, that ring composition and the figures isocolon and homoeoteleuton also appear in the long section quoted from Crates by Teles, which already has been discussed. Thus, one might claim that these stylistic devices are the work of Teles and not of the authors whom he cites. Another alternative, of course, is to consider the possibility that Crates and Stilpon, as contemporaries, could have developed styles full of rhetorical devices because of a similar educational background. Before considering this alternative further, however, one must proceed with an analysis of the content and style of the nineteen line quotation.

As was the case in the Crates section this passage begins, and ends, by stating its theme, which is (Teles, p. 22. 1) "τί λέγεις,..., καὶ τίνων ἡ φυγὴ <ἢ> ποίων ἀγαθῶν στερίσκει, τῶν περὶ <τὴν> ψυχὴν, ἢ τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα, ἢ τῶν ἐκτός;" The next eight lines deal in turn with each of the three aspects of good mentioned in the first sentence and attempt to show that the man in exile is not deprived of anything important, such as well-being, virtues, his sight or hearing. After asking whether (Teles, p. 22. 8 ff.) "...οὐ πολλοῖς ὤφθη τὰ πράγματα κατὰ τὴν τῶν τοιούτων ὕπαρξιν ἐπιφανέστερα γεγονότα φυγάδων γενομένων...," Stilpon uses first Phoenix, tutor of Achilles and then Themistocles as examples of the proper attitude toward exile. The theme is then repeated and followed by the concluding, almost ironic statement (Teles, p. 23. 3 ff.), "ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς πολλαχοῦ αὑτοὺς κατορύττομεν καὶ φυγάδες γενόμενοι καὶ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ μένοντες."

The most obvious device used by Stilpon to express the views just mentioned is the rhetorical question, for nine of them occur in this short passage. Three questions are followed by the brief answers "οὐ δή," "οὐδὲ τοῦτο," and "καὶ μάλα," which perhaps represent the imaginary interlocutor of the dialogue, although they may simply be assumed to be emphatic pauses in the mass of questions. A second notable characteristic is a fondness for parallel phrases linked by polysyndeton and sometimes having a similar number of syllables. For example, the phrase (Teles, p. 23. 3-4) "καὶ φυγάδες γενόμενοι καὶ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ μένοντες "shows not only polysyndeton but also the figures anaphora, in the repetition of καὶ, isocolon, and homoeoploton, in the correspondence of φυγάδες and μένοντες. One might note as a further instance the phrase (Teles, 22. 6) "ὑγιαίνειν καὶ ἰσχύειν καὶ ὀξὺ ὁρᾶν καὶ ὀξὺ ἀκούειν...," in which isocolon, polysyndeton, and anaphora also occur along with homoeoteleuton in the infinitive endings.[61] In contrast to the use of polysyndeton, asyndeton appears only once, in the question (Teles, p. 22.3), "εὐλογιστίας, ὀρθοπραγίας, εὐπραγίας ἢ φυγὴ στερίσκει;". Finally, in this discussion of style, one should note the inclusion of the following lines (Teles, p. 22. 12 ff.), which are a quotation from Homer, Iliad, IX 483 and a paraphrase of IX, 479:

> Πηλέα δ' ἐξικόμην,
> καί μ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε, πολὺν δέ μοι ὤπασε λαόν.[62]

The lines which Stilpon omits and which elaborate on the reception of Phoenix by Peleus probably were well-known to the reader, and so these two lines are sufficient to supply the basic idea concerning the good fortunes of an exile.

A comparison of the style of the Crates section (Teles, pp. 49-50) with that of the passage just discussed reveals only one important similarity beyond those of ring composition, isocolon, and homoeoteleuton previously mentioned. In both passages, a verse quotation is used near the end of the discussion,[63] but for slightly different purposes. Stilpon quotes Homer in order to complete his use of Phoenix as an example and to prove his contention that exile is not lacking in benefits. Crates, on the other hand, seems to be quoting Euripides in order to ornament his style and to emphasize, but not prove, his point that an old man longs for youth. Perhaps the fact that the Stilpon passage is an argumentative one while the quotation from Crates is a descriptive section, in which, of course, a point is being made, accounts for this difference. At any rate this variation, combined with the stylistic differences visible in the use of rhetorical questions and an imaginary interlocutor, on the one hand, by Stilpon, and the use of a descriptive style of short sentences and frequent asyndeton, on the other hand, by Crates, make it more likely that each of these passages is by a different author and that the use of ring composition and other devices by both is a coincidence. Further, one might note that,

XUM

as the appearance of many rhetorical devices shows, both philosophers must have had a standard rhetorical education as young men, a fact which accounts for any minor similarities in their choice of figures of speech, especially since their favorites, isocolon, homoeoteleuton and homoeoptoton, are all figures already used by Gorgias, the early Greek rhetorician.[64] One, finally, also should realize that the device of ring composition in which "l'idée initiale d'un élément compositionnel est répétée à la fin de celui-ci...," occurs as early as Homer, Odyssey, XIX, 392 ff., and is a common characteristic of archaic Greek literature.[65] The use of this device by two authors who must have studied Homer, as well as general rhetoric and poetry, as children, therefore, should not be surprising.

The primary reason for mentioning Stilpon in this chapter, of course, was not just to make the above comparison with the work of Crates but rather to see whether the Megarean philosopher had any influence on the development of the diatribe. Naturally one may assume that something in the style and content of his works attracted the Cynic Teles, who was able to draw from them a quotation which could fit into his own work.[66] There is also the more important possibility that Stilpon had some direct influence on Bion, especially in the famous personification of poverty quoted by Teles.[67] One, in fact, should consider the similarities in the following quotations from Stilpon and Bion as preserved by Teles:

Bion, in Teles, p. 7. 2 ff.

"...μὴ καλοῦ τινος δι᾽ ἐμὲ στερίσκῃ; μὴ σωφροσύνης; μὴ δικαιοσύνης; <μὴ> ἀνδρείας; ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεὴς εἶ;...

....

ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ <ἂν> δοκῶ ἄφωνος γενέσθαι· ἀλλ᾽ ἡμεῖς πάντα μᾶλλον αἰτιώμεθα ἢ τὴν ἑαυτῶν δυστροπίαν καὶ κακοδαιμονίαν...."

Stilpon, in Teles, p. 22. 1 ff.

"...καὶ τίνων ἡ φυγὴ <ἢ> ποίων ἀγαθῶν στερίσκει; τῶν περὶ <τὴν> ψυχὴν, ἢ τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα, ἢ τῶν ἐκτός; εὐλογιστίας, ὀρθοπραγίας, εὐπραγίας ἡ φυγὴ στερίσκει; οὐ δή· ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀνδρείας ἢ δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἄλλης τινὸς ἀρετῆς; οὐδὲ τοῦτο· ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμά τινος ἀγαθῶν;........

....

ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὐχ ὁρῶ· ἀλλ᾽ ἡμεῖς πολλαχοῦ αὑτοὺς κατορύττομεν καὶ φυγάδες γενόμενοι καὶ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ μένοντες.

In these two passages, first of all, there are obvious verbal parallels, as, for example, the use of the verb στερίσκειν, in the first sentence, along with an interrogative word (τινος, ποίων), expressing similar meaning. The words "δικαιοσύνης" and "ἀνδρείας" also appear in both passages, depending on the verb στερίσκειν. Further, the similarity of words and structure in the sentences "ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεὴς εἶ;" and "ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμά τινος ἀγαθῶν;" is obvious, and one also should note that the "ἀναγκαίων" of the first sentence refers to bodily needs such as drinking water and a bed, while the second phrase is referring to bodily functions such as sight and hearing. A final noticeable parallel occurs in the last two sentences of each which begin with the words "ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ" and "ἀλλ'ἡμεῖς," common phrases, to be sure. In addition to these verbal parallels one should note that both passages are constructed of a series of rhetorical questions but end with two positive statements which seem to chide the object of the discussion, the dissatisfied man, in the Bion passage, and the man afraid of exile, in the Stilpon passage.

The similarities between these two passages make one wonder whether Bion made direct use of a dialogue by the Megarean philosopher. Any comparison between fragments, especially fragments in the form of quotations included in a literary work, is dangerous, of course, since one cannot be certain that some important lines or words have not been omitted or undergone a change of order. Further, the parallels in this particular case are not necessarily convincing, since the possibility of coincidence is strong. The fact that Teles includes the quotation from Stilpon discussed above and also a shorter quotation (p. 59. 10) could indicate that Bion made use of Stilpon in some diatribes, and that Teles took over these sections from his teacher's work. As Hense has pointed out,[68] however, there is no reason to assume that Teles did not use Stilpon directly. The strongest statement one can made about the relationship between Bion and Stilpon, then, is that there is no reason to assume that Bion could not have read and quoted or imitated the work of the Megarean philosopher, especially since his student Teles quotes Stilpon, but the evidence to prove that he did so is slim and only partly convincing. One should emphasize, however, that Stilpon could have had some influence on the development of the diatribe by Bion and that the large fragment preserved by Teles perhaps can be taken as an example of a type of dialogue from which the diatribe form with its occasional dialogue could have evolved.

XUM

After Stilpon the next philosopher of some importance to the history of the diatribe is Zeno of Citium, student of Crates and then of Stilpon, who eventually founded the Stoic school when he began to give lectures in the colonnade or stoa known as the Stoa Poikile, acting as a teacher of young men and of any others who came to hear him.[69] In addition, he also wrote treatises such as the Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν βίου and the Περὶ παθῶν[70] and works called diatribes.[71] The surviving fragments of Zeno's work are too few to allow one to make an adequate evaluation of his style. The following lines, preserved from one of Zeno's diatribes by Sextus Empircus, however, do show a marked stylistic resemblance to the fragment of Stilpon preserved by Teles:

> "'διαμηρίζειν δὲ μηδὲν μᾶλλον μηδὲ ἧσσον παιδικὰ ἢ μὴ παιδικά, μηδὲ Θήλεα ἢ ἄρρενα· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα παιδικοῖς ἢ μὴ παιδικοῖς, οὐδὲ Θηλείαις ἢ ἄρρεσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτὰ πρέπει τε καὶ πρέποντα ἐστίν.' καὶ πάλιν 'διαμεμήρικας τὸν ἐρώμενον; οὐκ ἔγωγε. πότερον οὐκ ἐπεθύμησας αὐτὸν διαμηρίσαι; καὶ μάλα. ἀλλὰ ἐπιθυμήσας παρασχεῖν σοι αὐτὸν [ἢ] ἐφοβήθης κελεῦσαι; μὰ Δί'. ἀλλ' ἐκέλευσας; καὶ μάλα. εἶθ' οὐχ ὑπηρέτησέ σοι; οὐ γάρ.'"[72]

Here the questions followed by brief answers, the frequent use of "ἤ," and the figure homoeoptoton (as, for example, in the section beginning with παιδικὰ) remind one of the style of the dialogue fragment of Stilpon. The arrangement of the questions, however, forms a figure resembling "gradatio" or κλίμαξ, a configuration "in qua non ante ad consequens verbum descenditur quam ad superius ascensum est. . . ."[73] Here, for example, the "διαμεμήρικας" of the first question is reflected in the "διαμηρίσαι" of the second, while the "ἐπεθυμήσας" of the second question is repeated in the "ἐπιθυμήσας" of the third, with the connection between "κελεῦσαι" and "ἐκέλευσας" completing the figure. One cannot claim on the basis of this one figure that Zeno's style is more polished than that of Stilpon nor can one assume that any similarities between these two fragments automatically indicates dependence on the part of the student, since his interest in rhetoric[74] makes it likely that Zeno would have known and employed many such figures in his style. As in the case of the relationship between Stilpon and Bion, then, one only can say that the possibility of influence exists but is difficult to prove on the basis of the evidence. One also cannot prove that the diatribes of Zeno were at all like those written by Bion of Borysthenes and can only note that the fragments indicate a concern with ethical topics and a tendency toward "παρρησία" in the sense that they do not avoid distasteful themes.[75] Zeno, however, did make a collection of χρεῖαι or brief anecdotes generally expressing an ethical doctrine which may be a source for examples found in later diatribes and rhetorical works and which may represent his chief contribution to the diatribal tradition.[76]

B. Bion and Teles

Apparently more important than Zeno in the development of the diatribe is another pupil of Crates, Bion of Borysthenes, who wrote and delivered lectures on ethical themes, in a style perhaps similar to that of his Cynic teacher. The son of a freedman and a hetaera, Bion was sold into slavery along with his whole family and became the servant of a rhetorician who eventually bequeathed all his possessions to him.[77] Later Bion, whom Diogenes Laertius describes as "πολύτροπος" and a "σοφιστὴς ποικίλος," studied philosophy first with Crates, taking up the ascetic Cynic way of life, then with Theodorus the Cyrenaic, known as "the Atheist," and finally with Theophrastus, a course of study which perhaps accounts for the eclectic nature of his own views and also in part for the eclectic nature of the later diatribe which seldom confined itself to any one school of philosophy.[78] The theory that this eclectic philosopher and lecturer established through his written and oral lectures the characteristics of the genre of diatribe seems to rely on the statement of Erastosthenes, mentioned by Diogenes Laertius who notes, "διὰ δὴ οὖν τὸ παντὶ εἴδει λόγου κεκρᾶσθαί φασι λέγειν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἐρατοσθένην, ὡς πρῶτος Βίων τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἀνθινὰ ἐνέδυσεν."[79] What this statement means precisely is perhaps in doubt (but see footnote 392 below), but one at least can see in the fragments of Bion stylistic traits which indicate that he was writing in what could be termed a mixed genre, perhaps a combination of the dialogue and declamation, a genre which he, therefore, may have created himself, living as he did in the Hellinistic age when such mixing seems to have been a normal occurrence.[81] Possibly one might consider the works of Bion as being the final product of a line of development which began with Antisthenes, Aristippus and Bryson, or perhaps with Crates and Stilpon. The combination of influences coming from earlier public exhortations and lectures, from Bion's rhetorical and philosophical training, and from the social and political climate of the times may have been united finally to produce the genre of diatribe.[82]

The stylistic traits of the work of Bion are obvious enough and important enough to warrent a rather detailed treatment here, especially since they form the basis of what has come to be known as the diatribal style as used by later writers.[83] One of the most striking aspects of Bion's style, first of all, is the emphasis on τὸ σπουδαιογέλοιον, the Cynic mixture "...of jest and earnestness" which was "a method of joking about the serious things in life, or death..."[84] in order "...to enforce the *utile* by means of the *dulce*."[85] A good example of this tone is Bion's comment that Agamemnon, in tearing out his own hair when he was upset, was acting as if he could cure his grief through baldness.[86] A perhaps more subtle example is preserved by Plutarch who notes, concerning men who are moved by flattery, that Bion "ἀπείκαζε τοὺς τοιούτους ἀμφορεῦσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὤτων ῥᾳδίως μεταφερομένοις."[87] In various stylistic traits one also sees evidence of a tone of spoudaiogeloion. For example, χρείαι or anecdotes, such as one concerning Socrates, Alcibiades, and Xanthippe, are both humorous and instructive.[88] Other references to characters famous from literature or mythology, which are not humorous occur as well and serve to emphasize a point almost as effectively as the humorous anecdotes.[89] The employment by Bion of "χαρακτηρισμός," or "the minute delineation of satiric types,"[90] often is another source of humor and is reflected in some of the sayings attributed to him by Diogenes Laertius. For instance, Diogenes notes that Bion "πρὸς τὸν βάσκανον ἐσκυθρωπακότα, 'οὐκ οἶδα,' ἔφη, 'πότερον σοὶ κακὸν γέγονεν ἢ ἄλλῳ ἀγαθόν."[91] The description of men moved by flattery, noted above, is, of course, another example. Some of these remarks may indicate the influence of Antisthenes, who made similar brief sketches, or of Theophrastus, who for example, describes *kakologia* in his χαρακτῆρες, or, even perhaps, as G. C. Fiske notes, of sketches found in the mime or Attic New Comedy.[92] A third trait which can show spoudaiogeloion is parody, a trait already noticed in Crates. In Diogenes Laertius, for instance, appears the following parody of Homer, Iliad, III, 182 ("ὦ μάκαρ, Ἀτρεΐδη, μοιρηγενές ὀλβιόδαιμον"):

> ὦ πέπον Ἀρχύτα, ψαλληγενές, ὀλβιότυφε,
> τῆς ὑπάτης ἔριδος πάντων ἐμπειρότατ 'ἀνδρῶν.[93]

Further, Bion often quotes lines of poetry without any attempt at parody but rather with the intention of using the verse citation to support some point. Teles, for example, notes that Bion quoted the following lines (from Euripides, *Phoenissae*, 1452-1455) when he was discussing the fact that many tragedies had been written "περὶ ταφῆς ἀγωνία":

> θάψον δέ μὦ τεκοῦσα, καὶ σὺ, σύγγονε,
> ἐν γῇ πατρῴᾳ, καὶ πόλιν θυμουμένην
> παρηγορεῖτον, ὣς τοσόνδε γοῦν τύχω
> χθονὸς πατρῴας, κεἰ δόμους ἀπώλεσα.[94]

Other stylistic traits which do not show spoudaiogeloion also deserve mention here. The occasional use of dialogue, first of all, is quite important, since, as has been noted above, some scholars think that the diatribe is a descendant of the dialogue. As G. C. Fiske has stated, in Bion's work, "dialogue, even dramatic dialogue is still present..." and "...we are not yet reduced to the colorless φησίν of the later διατριβαί....[95] One should, of course, make a distinction here between the genre dialogue and the use of conversation as a stylistic device. Since the long history of the dialogue is beyond the scope of this discussion, the following definition given by Diogenes Laertius (III, 48) should serve as a basic description of the genre:

> ἔστι δὲ διάλογος <λόγος> ἐξ ἐρωτήσεως καὶ ἀποκρίσεως
> συγκείμενος περί τινος τῶν φιλοσοφουμένων καὶ πολιτικῶν
> μετὰ τῆς πρεπούσης ἠθοποιίας τῶν παραλαμβανομένων
> προσώπων καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν λέξιν κατασκευῆς.[96]

To this definition should be added the comments of Michel Ruch, who states in his Le *Préambule dans les Oeuvres Philosophiques de Ciceron* (p. 18) that the dialogue "...apparaît comme un genre hybride..." which lies "...à mi-chemin entre la poésie et la prose." If one approaches the fragments of Bion with this definition of dialogue in mind, one finds only one long section (Teles, p. 3-4, which seems to be Teles' work; see below after footnote 138.) which resembles a dialogue in that one speaker asks questions which are answered, generally with a brief remark such as "Ἀμέλει" or "Διὰ τὸ εἶναι," by a second person.[97] Both speakers are anonymous, and no attempt is made to create an ἠθοποιίαν for either interlocutor. Perhaps this anonymity represents the final step before the use of φησίν in later works to indicate an imaginary opponent.[98]

Dialogue in the sense of conversation used as a stylistic device, in contrast to the genre, occurs quite frequently in the χρεῖαι as the reported comments of the parties involved in the incident being narrated. For example, the following anecdote concerning Diogenes appears in a section of Teles (pp. 12.8 ff.) attributed to Bion by Hense:

> "καὶ ὅπερ Διογένης ἐποίησεν πρὸς τὸν πολυτελῆ φάμενον
> πόλιν εἶναι τὰς Ἀθήνας· λαβὼν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἦγεν εἰς τὸ
> μυροπωλεῖον καὶ ἐπυνθάνετο πόσου τῆς κύπρου ἡ κοτύλη.
> 'μνᾶς' φησὶν ὁ μυροπώλης· ἀνέκραγε 'πολυτελής γε ἡ πόλις'.
> ἀπῆγεν αὐτὸν· πάλιν εἰς τὸ μαγειρεῖον καὶ ἐπυνθάνετο πόσου τὸ
> ἀκροκώλιον. 'τριῶν δραχμῶν·' ἐβόα 'πολυτελής γε ἡ πόλις.' εἰς τὰ
> ἔρια πάλιν τὰ μαλακὰ καὶ πόσου τὸ πρόβατον. 'μνᾶς' φησίν· ἐβόα
> 'πολυτελής γε ἡ πόλις.' 'δεῦρο δή' φησί. κἀνταῦθα ἄγει αὐτὸν καὶ
> εἰς τοὺς θέρμους. 'πόσου ἡ χοῖνιξ;' 'χαλκοῦ' φησίν· ἀνέκραγεν ὁ
> Διογένης 'εὐτελής γε ἡ πόλις.' πάλιν εἰς τὰς ἰσχάδας, 'δύο χαλκῶν·'
> 'τῶν δὲ μύρτων;' 'δύο χαλκῶν·' 'εὐτελής γε ἡ πόλις.'"[99]

Such use of conversation within an ancedote seems to be a common practice, and while this usage perhaps is related to the genre of dialogue, it also possibly is connected with the rhetorical devices of "ἠθοποιία" or character delineation (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, L. 63) and "διάλογοι" or sermocinatio which is described as "...cum alicui personae sermo adtribuitur et is exponitur cum ratione dignitatis..." (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, LII.65). One might comment further here that, since dialogue in the

XUM

fragments attributed to Bion occurs primarily in anecdotes, one should be cautious in ascribing to him the employment of dialogue as a device in general use within his diatribes, and perhaps only should note that he uses anecdotes in which dialogue appears. The famous *prosopopoiia* of Poverty (Teles, p. 7), of course, is a monologue and does not need to be considered here as an exception.

As important as the use of dialogue in Bion is the appearance of what seems to be another prototype of the imaginary interlocutor of the later diatribe (see footnote 88). In Teles' work *Peri autarkeia* occurs a section (5.6 ff.) in which Bion argues, using multiple antitheses, in favor of his own simple way of life, contrasting himself possibly with Antigonus Gonatus (cf. Hense, p. 6, apparatus) or with some other ruler, whom he boldly addresses in the second person. A passage of this type does not involve true dialogue, since the *su* gives no answer to the diatribist, but does involve the use of some opponent who is asumed to hold a position at variance with that supported by the speaker. Further, the exhorative nature of the diatribe is especially evident in this section, since Bion has urged his listener not to wish to be the *protologos* when he is only a *deuterologos*, a remark which then is illustrated by the antitheses mentioned above. Perhaps more closely related to the *phesin* of the later diatribal tradition is the use of *ton enkalounta* to designate the person to whom *Penia* addresses her angry remarks (Teles, 7.2; see below at footnote 104 ff.) and who seems to represent the "anonymous butt, whose objections, invariably futile. . ." were introduced by *phesin* (Kenney, *op. cit*., p. 18; cf. Bultmann, *op. cit*., p. 10) in diatribes. The complaints of *Penia's*, and hence Bion's, opponent are not specifically delineated, but they are implied by the content of her indignant questions and by Bion's earlier remarks concerning the simplicity of life. An additional possible type of reference to an imaginary interlocutor has been noted by Hense ("Prolegomena," p. XCV; cf. Bultmann, p. 11), who has commented that "certum est in Bionis diatribis interlocutorem non defuisse, nec non versibus pugnatum est." Further, according to Hense, "Theognidis Euripidis Antiphanis aliquot versus adhiberi modo vidimus ex persona adversarii." Hense cites as an example of such an attack the Euripidean quotation found in Teles' Peri phyges (Teles, 30.4) in which the words of Euripides are ". . .ita cumulari, ut quot adfertuntur opiniones vulgo probatae totidem adferantur versiculi," (Hense, "Prolegomena," p. XCVI). Since this passage, which concerns the foolishness of concern for the burial of one's body, has an especially polemical and facetions tone and disposes of a common opinion through ridicule, one is inclined to agree with Hense that Bion here is attacking an imaginary opponent and that the verses serve to augment that attack.

Another device related to the diatribist's polemic against an imaginary opponent is the exhortation addressed to the audience and expressed as an imperative. Bion warns his listener, for example, "γέρων γέγονας· μὴ ζήτει τὰ τοῦ νέου" (Teles, 10.6; cf. Bultmann, p. 15). This exhortation appears in a section which includes advice obviously addressed to a general audience and must be distinguished from one such as that cited above which seems to be connected with an attack on an imaginary opponent. The fact that the remains of Bion's work consist of fragments taken from their original context, of course, prevents one from distinguishing absolutely between the use of imperatives or of second person singular verbs to attack an opponent or to exhort an audience, but one may note the probability that this distinction did exist. Since it is the nature of the diatribe to exhort with a view to correction, however, one may assume that all attacks are directed ultimately at the follies of the diatribist's listeners, even when an imaginary interlocutor is set up to represent a certain point of view.

In addition to the other traits mentioned, Bion's style includes the frequent use of similes in which comparisons are made with familiar experiences and aspects of daily life.[100] In Plutarch's *Moralia* (561 C 19; Teubner, III, 1972), for instance, is preserved a simile in which the diatribist states that *ton theon* punishing children because of the sins of their fathers is more ridulous than a physician who treats a child because of the illness of his grandfather or father. Another example, as recorded by Teles, occurs in a discussion of death, in which Bion comments, "οὐχ ὑπομένω, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐκ συμποσίου ἀπαλλάττομαι οὐθὲν δυσχεραίνων, οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βίου, ὅταν [ἡ] ὥρα ᾖ, 'ἔμβα πορθμίδος ἔρυμα,'" using comparisons drawn from feasting and travelling.[101] In addition to these and other similes based on common experiences one finds others, such as the following one, which include lessons in practical wisdom:

> "ὁ δὲ Βίων, ὥσπερ τῶν θηρίων, φησί, παρὰ τὴν λῆψιν
> ἡ δῆξις γίνεται, κἂν μέσου τοῦ ὄφεως ἐπιλαμβάνῃ, δηχθήσῃ,
> ἐὰν τοῦ τραχήλου, οὐδὲν πείσῃ· οὕτω καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, φησί,
> παρὰ τὴν ὑπόληψιν ἡ ὀδύνη γίνεται, καὶ ἐὰν μὲν οὕτως ὑπολάβῃς
> περὶ αὐτῶν, ὡς ὁ Σωκράτης, οὐκ ὀδυνήσῃ, ἐὰν δὲ ὡς ἑτέρως, ἀνιάσῃ,
> οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων τρόπων καὶ τῆς
> ψευδοῦς δόξης."[102]

All of these comparisons are notable for their simplicity and reflect the desire of the speaker to be understood quickly and to keep his audience's attention by speaking of familiar subjects in, perhaps, a slightly new way.[103]

Another device which must have been effective is "allegorical personification," prosopopoiia, which is defined in the Rhetorica ad Herennium as "cum aliqua quae non adest persona confingitur quasi adsit, aut cum res muta aut informis fit eloquens, et forma ei et oratio adtribuitur ad dignitatem adcommodata aut actio quaedam. . . ."[104] In use at least as early as the fifth century when it is found in Parmenides, Prodicus, and Aristophanes, the personification of abstracts and of concrete objects (such as cities) may have developed from the fable, which features "animal life, and inanimate objects also, endowed with human speech, and always for the purpose of carrying some moral lesson."[105] Bion's most famous use of this device is the passage in which Penia, is allowed to address the man who is dissatisfied with his lot and to remind him of all the simple joys that she has provided for him.[106] In another passage recorded by Teles occurs the following simile in which the use of τύχη could be considered personification by a modern definition but which fails to qualify by the ancient definition given above:

> "Ἡ τύχη ὥσπερ ποιήτριά τις οὖσα παντοδαπὰ ποιεῖ πρόσωπα, ναυαγοῦ, πτωχοῦ, φυγάδος, ἐνδόξου, ἀδόξου."[107]

If this had been developed into a prosopopoiia, of course, Tyche herself would have explained her role as poietria (see below at footnote 343).

In the prosopopoiia described above and in other passages the frequent use of rhetorical questions and the lack of periodic sentences are notable stylistic traits.[108] Penia, when personified, for example, really does not expect an answer when she asks, among other things, "τί μοι μάχῃ; μὴ καλοῦ τινος δι' ἐμὲ στερίσκῃ; μὴ σωφροσύνης; μὴ δικαιοσύνης; <μὴ> ἀνδρείας; ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεὴς εἶ; ἢ οὐ μεσταὶ μὲν αἱ ὁδοὶ λαχάνων;...."[109] There are nineteen questions in Penia's speech which must be considered an extreme example of the use of rhetorical questions, and which makes obvious the futility of attempting an answer, as Bion sees when he comments (Teles, p. 8.5) "εἰ ταῦτα λέγοι ἡ Πενία, τί ἂν ἔχοις ἀντειπεῖν;" As another instance one may consider the following passage, taken from an expository section (Teles, p. 36. 11 ff.):

> "ἢ τὶ διαφέρει μὴ ἔχειν ἢ οὕτως ἔχειν ὡς αἱ Φορκίδες τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ἀποκεῖμεν<ον ἔχειν λέγοντ>αι, αὐτὰς δὲ εἰς φραγμοὺς καὶ βόθρους καὶ βόρβορον ἐμπίπτειν, μηθὲν προορωμένας, ἀλλ' ἐῶσας ἀποκεῖσθαι, ἕως ὅτου καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ὁ Περσεὺς ὑφείλετο; ἢ τί διαφέρει μὴ ἔχειν τροφὴν ἢ τοιαύτην ἔχειν, ἧς οὐ μὴ γεύσηται,... ἰχθῦς καὶ περιστέρια ἢ Αἰγυπτίῳ κύνα ἢ Ἕλληνι κρανίον ἀνθρώπου; ὁμοίως γὰρ σπανιεῖ τροφῆς καὶ ἔχων ταύτην καὶ μὴ ἔχων."[110]

Here, at least, the series of questions is interrupted by a declarative statement, but the effect of the questions remains strong and especially useful for capturing the attention of an audience which may tend to lose interest in a strictly expository section. Also an important factor in pleasing one's audience is the length of the sentence. A moral lecture composed of involved sentences undoubtedly would bore the average listener. In the work of a speaker such as Bion, sentences occur which are rather short as compared to the long periodic ones used by a writer such as Isocrates (such as at the beginning of his Panegyricus). Most of the passages already quoted from Bion in this paper show this tendency, but the following lines, which contain a comparison drawn from sailing, provide a striking example:

> "διὸ δεῖ μὴ τὰ πράγματα πειρᾶσθαι μετατιθέναι, ἀλλ' αὑτὸν παρασκευάζειν πρὸς ταῦτά πως ἔχοντα, ὅπερ ποιοῦσιν οἱ ναυτικοί· οὐ γὰρ τοὺς ἀνέμους καὶ τὴν θάλατταν πειρῶνται μετατιθέναι,

> ἀλλὰ παρασκευάζουσιν αὐτοὺς δυναμένους πρὸς ἐκεῖνα στρέφεσθαι.εὐδία, γαλήνη· ταῖς κώπαις πλέουσι.κατὰ ναῦν ἄνεμος· ἐπῆραν τὰ ἄρμενα. ἀντιπέπνευκεν·ἐστείλαντο, μεθείλαντο . καὶ σὺ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα χρῶ. γέρων γέγονας·μὴ ζήτει τὰ τοῦ νέου."[111]

The short phrases, often composed of isocola, make this comparison vivid, lively, and therefore effective.

Such traits as the use of prosopopoiia and rhetorical questions and the understanding of the type of sentence that fulfills the purpose of a certain type of writing are indicative of the rhetorical training of Bion. In addition, the frequent appearance of various figures reveals the rhetorical nature of the genre of diatribe. The following passage, for instance, provides an example of the figures isocolon and asyndeton:

> "καθάπερ καὶ ἐξ οἰκίας, φησὶν ὁ Βίων, ἐξοικιζόμεθα, ὅταν τὸ ἐνοίκιον ὁ μισθώσας οὐ κομιζόμενος τὴν θύραν ἀφέλῃ, τὸν κέραμον ἀφέλῃ, τὸ φρέαρ ἐγκλείσῃ, οὕτω, φησί, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ σωματίου ἐξοικίζομαι, ὅταν ἡ μισθώσασα φύσις τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀφαιρῆται τὰ ὦτα τὰς χεῖρας τοὺς πόδας· ...."[72]

As Otto Hense notes, here the cola καθάπερ...ἐξοικιζόμεθα and οὕτω... ἐξοικίζομαι have an equal number of syllables, showing the use of the figure "isocolon", while the figure "asyndeton" is quite obvious in the lack of connection in the sections of the phrase "ὅταν...οὕτω.[113] A third figure, "antistrophe", in which, according to the Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, 13.19, "non...primum repetimus verbum, sed ad postremum continenter revertimur," is used here in the repetition of ἀφέλῃ. Further, the emphatic

XUM

repetition of sounds and possible word play in the close proximity of ἐξ οἰκία, ἐξοικιζόμεθα, and ἐνοίκιον also should be noted.

Antithesis or "...ex contrariis rebus oratio conficitur" (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, 15.21) also occurs often.[114] For example, in the fragments of *Peri autarkeias* (Teles, p. 6.6 ff.) Bion contrasts himself with the man who is dissatisfied and says "σὺ κέχρησαι τοῖς πολλοῖς καλῶς, ἐγὼ δὲ τοῖς ὀλίγοις· οὐ γὰρ τὰ πολυτελῆ, φησί, τρέφει, οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις μὲν ἔστι μετ' ὠφελείας χρῆσθαι, τοῖς δὲ ὀλίγοις καὶ εὐτελέσι μετὰ σωφροσύνης οὐκ ἔστι καὶ ἀτυφίας." The following lines from the *Peri phyges* (Teles, p. 24.4 ff.) show another obvious antithesis, as well as the use of isocolon:

> "σὺ πολλῶν [ἢ ὀλίγων] καὶ ἡβώντων βασιλεύεις, ἐγὼ δὲ
> ὀλίγων καὶ ἀνήβων παιδαγωγὸς γενόμενος, καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον
> ἐμαυτοῦ·"[115]

In addition to the figures already mentioned Bion frequently emphasizes some point through the use of anaphora. The following passage (Teles, p. 5.3 ff.) shows not only the use of anaphora, but also of isocolon and antithesis:

> "καὶ γὰρ αὕτη, φησὶν ὁ Βίων, ὥσπερ ποιήτρια, ὁτὲ μὲν
> πρωτολόγου, ὁτὲ δὲ δευτερολόγου περιτίθησι πρόσωπον,
> καὶ ὁτὲ μὲν βασιλέως, ὁτὲ δὲ ἀλήτου."

In the *Peri autarkeias*, also, occurs a similar example (Teles, p. 12.5-8) in which Bion asks ",οὕτως ἐάν σοι δείξω δύο γέροντας, δύο πένητας, δύο φεύγοντας, τὸν μὲν ἐν τῇ πάσῃ εὐκολίᾳ καὶ ἀπαθείᾳ ὄντα, τὸν δὲ ἐν τῇ πάσῃ ταραχῇ, οὐ φανερὸν ὅτι οὐ τὸ γῆρας, οὐ τὴν πενίαν, οὐ τὴν ξενίαν αἰτιατέον ἀλλ' ἕτερόν τι;" This passage, itself a rhetorical question, abounds in figures, including anaphora in the repetition of δύο and οὐ, asyndeton, isocolon, and homoeoptoton.[116] Several other fragments of Bion's work show a fondness for repetition of any sort. In a section of Teles' Περὶ αὐταρκείας (Teles, pp. 10.6 - 11.2) one finds the command "μὴ ζήτει" used to begin three separate sentences, not in such a way as to form the figure anaphora with all three, but rather as a strong exhortation. Another passage in the same work contains several antitheses, and each contrast is emphasized by the use of "σὺ μὲν ... ἐγω δὲ," a combination which appears four times within six lines, and which is a type of repetition reminiscent of anaphora but, of course, not identical with that figure. A third example of this almost formulaic type of repetition occurs in the use of "ἐξ ἑτέρας ... εἰς ἑτέραν ..." in the sentence (Teles, p. 25.6-7), "...δύναμαι δὲ μεταβὰς ὥσπερ ἐξ ἑτέρας νεὼς εἰς ἑτέραν ὁμοίως εὐπλοεῖν, οὕτως ἐξ ἑτέρας πόλεως εἰς ἑτέραν ὁμοίως εὐδαιμονεῖν," which is notable also as an example of the use of isocolon, homoeoteleuton, and homoeoptoton.[117]

In addition to these instances of the repeated use of the same words or phrases, homoeoptoton and homoeoteleuton often are employed. Several examples have already been mentioned in the discussion of other figures, but one might add others, including the following sentence which shows the use of antithesis and homoeoptoton:

> "σὺ μὲν ἄρχεις καλῶς, ἐγὼ δὲ ἄρχομαι, φησί, καὶ σὺ μὲν πολλῶν, ἐγὼ δὲ ἑνὸς τουτουῒ παιδαγωγὸς γενόμενος, καὶ σὺ μὲν εὔπορος γενόμενος δίδως ἐλευθερίως, ἐγὼ δὲ λαμβάνω εὐθαρσῶς παρὰ σοῦ οὐχ ὑποπίπτων οὐδὲ ἀγεννίζων οὐδὲ μεμψιμοιρῶν."[118]

Homoeoteleuton is evident in the verb endings of the questions (Teles, p. 7.9 ff.) ", καὶ ὁ διψῶν ἥδιστα πίνει καὶ ἥκιστα τὸ μὴ παρὸν ποτὸν ἀναμένει; ἢ πεινᾷ τις πλακοῦντα ἢ διψᾷ Χῖον;" As a final example of the use of these two figures, the following sentence is especially noteworthy, since it includes both:

> "ἢ τί διαφέρει ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαυθῆναι ἢ ὑπὸ κυνὸς
> καταβρωθῆναι ἢ ἐπάνω τῆς γῆς ὄντα ὑπὸ κοράκων ἢ
> καταρυχθέντα ὑπὸ σκωλήκων;"[119]

The effect of all of the repetitive figures noted must have been strong, and perhaps they can be assumed to have served didactic as well as ornamental purposes and to have made the listener remember what he heard. Of course, an excessive use of such figures can make the listener more conscious of sound than of content and, therefore, make a speech entertaining rather than instructive.[120] Since Bion's work exists only in fragments, however, one cannot make a definite statement concerning the purpose and effect of such figures as used by him and can note only the possibilities already mentioned.

One final device which should be included here is the figure commutatio or antimetabole, that is "...cum duae sententiae inter se discrepantes ex transiectione ita efferuntur ut a priore posterior contraria priori proficiscatur..." (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, 28.38). Two good examples are preserved by Diogenes Laertius. In the first Bion "πρός τὸν τὰ χωρία κατεδηδοκότα,‘ τὸν μὲν Ἀμφιάραον,’ ἔφη‘, ἡ γῆ κατέπιε, σὺ δὲ τὴν γῆν,"[121] making a wordplay, of course, on the word "γῆ." The following example also is recorded:

> "πρὸς τὸν μικρολόγον πλούσιον,‘ οὐχ οὗτος,’ ἔφη‘, τὴν
> οὐσίαν κέκτηται, ἀλλ' ἡ οὐσία τοῦτον."[122]

These wordplays, just like the other figures noted above, have the effect of capturing the audience's attention and of emphasizing a point.

All of the figures and devices which have been discussed above are, of course, the honey used to entice the "patient" to take in the medicine of ethical philosophy, if one may paraphrase Lucretius (I, 936-942) here. Whether Bion actually was trying to help his audience or whether he was only a sophist eager for a hearing cannot be determined, although one should take note of the fact that the account in Diogenes Laertius, which is hardly favorable to Bion, is based on hostile sources, as Hense has shown.[123] The type of philosophy dispensed by Bion, however, can be determined from the fragments of his works quoted by Teles in diatribes which bear titles such as Περὶ αὐταρκείας, περὶ φύγῆς, Περὶ πενίας καὶ πλούτου, and Περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τέλος ἡδονήν, showing concern with practical ethics rather than with metaphysics, as one would expect in works meant to be popular philosophy for the average man.[124] Although summaries of all of these are too long to include here, a few themes should be noted, especially those which tended to become commonplaces in later authors. The Cynic background of this eclectic philosopher, first of all, is evident in the frequent appearance of themes dealing with the ascetic way of life and the uselessness of wealth, themes which could derive from Diogenes or Crates. In the Peri autarkeias, for instance, Πενία chides the man who cannot be content with virtue and a simple life (including κρῆναι ὕδατος and a bed provided by the earth), and she asks him "ἢ πεινᾷ τις πλακοῦντα ἢ διψᾷ Χῖον; ἀλλ᾽ οὐ ταῦτα διὰ τρυφὴν ζητοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι; ἢ οἰκήσεις οὐ παρέχω σοι προῖκα, τὸν μὲν χειμῶνα τὰ βαλανεῖα, θέρους δὲ τὰ ἱερά;"[125] Bion also warns that one should avoid wealth which can ruin a man's character,[126] and that one should be aware of the changeable nature of Fortune, who (Teles, p. 5.5-6) "...ὁτὲ μὲν πρωτολόγου, ὁτὲ δὲ δευτερολόγου, περιτίθησι πρόσωπον, καὶ ὁτὲ μὲν βασιλέως, ὁτὲ δὲ ἀλήτου."

XUM

Finally, one must not try to alter circumstances "...ἀλλ' αὐτὸν παρασκευάζειν πρὸς ταῦτά πως ἔχοντα, ὅπερ ποιοῦσιν οἱ ναυτικοί...."[127]

Other popular themes involve old age and death. Old age, τὸ γῆρας, sometimes is included in lists of possible misfortunes with emphasis placed on the idea that it is not necessarily a major evil or something to be blamed as a cause of evil. Such an attitude is evident in the comment (Teles, p. 8, 6-8)", . . . πάντα μᾶλλον αἰτιώμεθα ἢ τὴν ἑαυτῶν δυστροπίαν καὶ κακοδαιμονίαν, τὸ γῆρας, τὴν πενίαν, τὸν ἀπαντήσαντα, τὴν ἡμέραν, τὴν ὥραν, τὸν τόπον." In a similar passage (Teles, p. 12.6-8) Bion asks, "οὕτως ἐάν σοι δείξω δύο γέροντας, δύο πένητας, δύο φεύγοντας, τὸν μὲν ἐν τῇ πάσῃ εὐκολίᾳ καὶ ἀπαθείᾳ ὄντα, τὸν δὲ ἐν τῇ πάσῃ ταραχῇ, οὐ φανερὸν ὅτι οὐ τὸ γῆρας, οὐ τὴν πενίαν, οὐ τὴν ξενίαν αἰτιατέον ἀλλ' ἕτερόν τι;" Old age also is connected with the theme of contentment with one's circumstances, as the following warning shows (Teles, p. 10.6 ff.):

> "καὶ σὺ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα χρῶ. γέρων γέγονας· μὴ
> ζήτει τὰ τοῦ νέου."

This exhortation, of course, reminds one of the quotation from Crates, previously discussed, which mentions the longing of old age for youth,[128] but any direct influence of Crates on this passage cannot be proved. One final usage of the theme of old age, which seems to sum up Bion's views, is found in Diogenes Laertius, who writes that Bion "μὴ δεῖν ἔφασκεν ὀνειδίζειν τὸ γῆρας, εἰς ὅ, ἔφη, πάντες εὐχόμεθα ἐλθεῖν."[129]

The proper attitude toward death is another favorite theme. Dying is compared to leaving one's home or a banquet (Teles, pp. 10-11), and the the audience is reminded that it is easy to die when one wants to, as the following passages advises (Teles, p. 15.9-11):

> "καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ἐκποιῇ πενητεύουσι <δεῖ> μένειν ἐν τῷ βίῳ,
> εἰ δὲ μή, ῥᾳδίως ἀπαλλάττεσθαι ὥσπερ ἐκ πανηγύρεως
> [οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βίου]."[130]

In addition, concern for one's tomb is ridiculed, since "εἰ δὲ μὴ κρυφθείης, ἀλλὰ ἄταφος <ῥιφθείης>, τὶ τὸ δυσχερές;"[131] One also should not fear burial in a strange land since (Teles, p. 30.8) "εἰ δὲ μὴ τύχοις χθονὸς πατρῴας, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ ξένης ταφείης, τί ἔσται τὸ διάφορον; ἢ ἐκ θηβῶν μὲν εἰς ᾅδου ὁ Χάρων πορθμεύει ...;" Further, no difficulties need be expected after death since "εὔκολον...τὴν εἰς ᾅδου ὁδόν·καταμύοντας γοῦν ἀπιέναι."[132] The survivors of the deceased also receive advice, being asked "πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἀλόγιστον καὶ ἄλλως μάταιον τὸ τελευτήσαντος τοῦ φίλου καθῆσθαι κλαίοντα καὶ λυπούμενον καὶ ἑαυτὸν προσκαταφθείροντα; δέον, ἵνα καὶ τι μᾶλλον φιλόσοφος δόξῃ παρὰ τοῖς ἀποπλήκτοις πρὸ τοῦ τελευτῆσαι τὸν φίλον ὀδυνᾶσθαι <καὶ> κλαίειν, ἐνθυμούμενον ὅτι αὐτῷ ὁ φίλος θνητὸς ἐγένετο καὶ ἄνθρωπος."[133] Many other examples of this and other themes could be cited here, but those that have been noted should give one an idea of the content of Bion's work. Chiefly, one should observe the simplicity of the advice given and should not be too concerned with attaching every comment to some particular philosophical school, since many of the themes may derive from "popular wisdom" as their "common-sense spirit" perhaps indicates.[134]

The influence of Bion on the style and content of later writings seems to have been widespread. His student Teles, "a fourth-rate writer of little originality," is responsible for preserving many fragments of Bion's work, as well as fragments of Crates and Metrocles, another pupil of Crates.[135] In addition to Teles, a variety of writers and philosophers ranging from Ariston of Ceos, the peripatetic, down to the Roman writers Lucilius and

Horace, seem to have known and imitated the Bionean diatribes. A few of these authors will be considered now in an effort to show their connection with the originator of the diatribe style.

Teles, first of all, was "a Megarian schoolmaster who flourished in the second half of the third century" and who also seems to have been a Cynic, although, coming from Megara, he could have been familiar with the doctrines of the Megarian school and even with the dialogues of Stilpon.[136] His work is known only from the excepts found in Stobaeus which were taken either from an epitome of Teles made by an unidentified Theodorus or from a gnomologicum containing excepts from the Theodorean epitome.[137] In these excepts, which are at least "twice-removed" from the original, one finds the quotations of Bion, Crates, and Stilpon, which already have been discussed, as well as quotations from other philosophers and authors, but there is very little which can be identified definitely as the original work of Teles himself, a fact which makes a stylistic analysis difficult.[138] D. R. Dudley, however, in his A History of Cynicism, p. 86, argues that the Peri tou dokein kai tou einai (Teles, pp. 3-4) contains "...less extraneous matter..." than the other fragments and can be used to judge Teles' style. While one might question the suitability of the use of the word "extraneous," Dudley may be correct in assuming that this fragment is a representative one, since there are other passages in the fragments which feature series of questions and answers (such as Teles, pp. 25 ff., 33.1 ff., 60.14 ff.), varying in length, which cannot be attributed definitely to some other source, although the influence of Xenophon often is possible (as Hense observes in his apparatus). Teles apparently tended to include long passages of dialogue within his diatribes, possibly in imitation of Bion or perhaps in imitation of other sources (cf. Teles, p. 3, apparatus), and the Peri tou dokein probably is a fragment taken by the epitomizer from a diatribe by Teles. In the text of this fragment are found many of the same devices which are found in Bion, a similarity which may be due to the influence of that writer or merely to the rhetorical education of Bion and Teles. Homoeoteleuton (Teles, pp. 4.4, 4.11-12, 4.13 ff.), homoeoptoton (pp. 3.11 and 4.4), asyndeton (p. 4.4), polysyndeton (pp. 4.7, 4.8-;-. 4.16), antistrophe (p. 4.4), alliteration (pp. 3.11-12 and 4.7), and isocolon (pp. 3.11-12 and 4.15-16) are all found in this fragment which is composed almost entirely of questions and brief answers. Missing are the character sketches, poetic quotations, spoudaiogeloion, and anecdotes found in Bion's work, although there is one reference to Ajax (p. 4.11) in this passage and the tone occasionally is polemical, but not as polemical as that found in Bion's prosopopoiia of Penia. All of these missing diatribal traits, of course, could have appeared in sections preceding or following the preserved dialogue fragment. In contrast to the effect of the figures in the passages of Bion, however, the devices that do appear in this text are repetitive in a bad sense and make even more monotonous an already dull discussion.[139]

Although his style may leave much to be desired, Teles still has special importance as the best-preserved representative of the diatribe style as originated by Bion. His fragments, then, may indicate the framework of the genre. The excepts from the Peri autarkeias, for example, begin with comments by Bion on the power of Fortune and the need for one to be content with the simple life (and therefore independent of fate), as illustrated in the prosopopoiia of Penia which follows (Teles, pp. 5.1-8.8). In the next sections occur quotations from Diogenes (pp. 8.10), Xenophon (p. 12.2 ff.), Crates (p. 14.6 ff.), and Bion (p. 15.11 ff.), as well as two similes taken from Bion (p. 9) and χρείαι concerning Diogenes (10.8 ff. and 12.8 ff.), Alcibiades, Socrates, and Xanthippe (pp. 17 ff.), all of which are loosely connected to the themes of contentment and self-sufficiency. The Περὶ φυγῆς follows a similar pattern, conducting its discussion of exile through quotations from Stilpon (pp. 21.5-23.4), Aristippus (p. 29-13), and Bion (pp. 30-31), verse citations from Homer (p. 22.12), Euripides (pp. 30.4 ff. and 31.4 ff.), and unidentified poets (pp. 28.2 and 30.10), a χρείαν concerning Themistocles (p. 22.14 ff.), examples concerning Heracles (p. 28.5 ff.) and Spartans (p. 28.7), and long sections of dialogue (pp. 24 ff.). To these examples of the form of the diatribe may be added the *Peri Penias kai Ploutos* which includes most of the diatribal traits which have been discussed above. The surviving fragment of this work begins with the remark (Teles, 33.2) that the acquisition of *chrematon* seems to free one from want and need, a statement concerning which Hense (p. 33, *apparatus*) observes, "sunt verba interlocutoris," (see above at footnote 95). Teles quickly answers his interlocutor (who is neither named nor described) with a rhetorical question (cf. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 13) concerning the inability of the wealthy to use their possessions (cf. Oltramare, p. 54, theme 46a). Two poetic quotations concerning Priam, apparently adapted from Homeric verses which do not concern the king (cf. Hense, pp. 33-34, *apparatus*), illustrate the point of Teles' rhetorical question by stating that Priam did not dare to sit upon a chair although *pollon kata oikon conton*, but sat down on the ground and wallowed in the dirt, apparently because of his grief at the death of Hector. In order to make sure that his audience understands his point the diatribist repeats his basic theme with slight variation when he notes that some men, when many things have come to them, are unable to enjoy them because of aneleutherian. Adding a touch of humor Teles then comments that mice and ants eat more than these men. Examples concerning Laertes and Tantalus (with a quotation from Homer) follow and lead into further comments concerning the avaricious rich man, which provide a brief characterismos describing the activities of the aneleutheros in a style reminiscent of Theophrastus' Characteres (cf. Theophrastus' sketches of the aneleutheros (Diels, 22) and of the aischrokedes (Diels, 30) and above at footnote 80 ff.). Next, citing the archaioi (35.9) as his source (cf. Hense, "Prolegomena," p. XLVIII and Wilamowitz, Antigonos, p. 307, on the old Cynics) Teles presents the opinion that poverty and wealth do not change a man's disposition (36.2 ff.), and that one who is aplestos, aneleutheros, alazon, and deilos will be in want and in need.

After these remarks the interlocutor makes a second appearance (36.6) and asks how those men whom the diatribist has been discussing are in need of those things which they have, a question which seems rather paradoxical. Teles answers his interlocutor by inserting an analogy made by Bion in the form of a rhetorical question which refers to the trapezitai or bankers who keep things but do not own or have the use of them. There follows an example concerning the Phorcides, who possessed one eye but did not use it, and therefore continually bumped or fell into fences or pits until Perseus finally took away the eye (36.11-37.1). This telling mythological illustration is a prime example of spoudaiogeloion and presumably is the work of Bion (cf. Hense, p. 36, apparatus who comments on the facetias et leporem Bionis). The diatribe continues with further comments concerning the need to enjoy what one possesses and includes a mutilated reference which seems to enumerate foods which certain races of people will not eat (cf. Hense, p. 37, apparatus on superstition), a reference which reflects the Cynic practice of citing foreign customs in order to prove that actions considered repulsive or unnatural by the Greeks are considered normal by other peoples and therefore are natural actions (cf. Oltramare, p. 46, theme 14a). In this section from 36.6-37.5 the author is attempting to show that possessing something which one does not use is the same thing as possessing nothing, a position which cannot be supported by logic, but which cleverly is developed through analogies which should be convincing to the average listener who will not stop to analyze the arguments involved. Teles' method here seems to be similar to that used, according to Aristotle (Ars Rhetorica, 1402a8) for a phainomenon enthymema para to me haplos eikos alla ti eikos, a basically sophistic type of argument which the philosopher rejects as pseudos and as having a place in no techne other than rhetoric and eristic (1402a26-27). The appearance of such an argument here, of course, is a further indication of the diatribe's connection with rhetoric and also is indicative of the possible relationship of the genre to the teachings of the early sophists whose interest in ethical problems and in the effective means of presenting one's arguments (cf. M. Untersteiner, The Sophists, passim) may be considered an ancestor of the form of lecture

XUM

employed by Bion and Teles. Further, the eristic nature of this type of presentation reminds one of the arguments concerning definitions conducted by Socrates in Platonic dialogues such as the *Charnides*, and in view of the presence of an interlocutor who asks questions for himself in this section of Teles' diatribe, may be an indication of the influence of the dialogue upon the diatribe, postulated by Eduard Norden in his *Die Antike Kunstprosa* (I, p. 129).

Teles continues his remarks concerning possessing and using with another reference to the *archaioi*, whom he previously mentioned as authorities (cf. 35.9), but who, in this case, are not necessarily old Cynics (cf. Hense, p. 37, *apparatus*). These *archaioi*, using a rhetorical argument based upon the difference in the meanings of *chremata* or "things used" and *ktemata* or "things possessed," made a distinction, according to Teles, between those who use what they possess, and therefore have *chremata*, and those who only acquire possessions which they neither use nor share, and who therefore have *ktemata*. Further, the diatribist's authorities observed that just as possessions upon which a king or a ruler has set his seal cannot be touched, so the *aneleutheria* and *dyselpistia* of some men set their seals upon possessions and do not allow *ta hyparchonta* to be touched. Men who are *aneleutherioi*, therefore, are in want, and, although they long for many things, they are unable to use them (37.9-38.4). These comments by the *archaioi* serve as an additional "proof" for the diatribist's claims concerning *to echein* and *to me echein* and are an example of a rhetorical proof based upon the opinions of all or of most men or of the *agathoi*

XUM

(Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, 1398b 20-22). In this case the archaioi are held up as authorities whose views lend weight to the position of Bion and Teles.

With transition provided only by dio Teles (38.4 ff.) introduces a second, but related topic, when he inserts an anecdote in which Crates, replying to one who asked ti oun moi estai philosophesanti, observes "you will be able to unfasten your leathern wallet easily and to take out and give freely with your hand, and not turn and hesitate and tremble, just like those whose hands are paralysed." Further, according to the Cynic, one who pursues philosophy will not grieve when he sees his wallet empty, will be able to chrasthai proelomenos raidios (in contrast, of course, to those men previously mentioned by Teles), and will not long for things which he does not have. This ideal person, finally, will live satisfied by tois parousi, neither longing for ton aponton nor being displeased with tois symbebekosin. With this description begins what should be considered the positive section of the Peri penia kai plouton, which offers an alternative to the foolish behavior and attitudes described in 33.3-38.4. Teles does not abandon his attack upon aneleutheria, but he now attempts to point out the benefits of penia and the Cynic way of life.

After his anecdote concerning Crates the diatribist warns that "if one wishes to be freed from want and need or to free someone else, let him not seek chremata for him." In support of this contention Teles presents a simile by Bion who compares the action of giving chremata to the foolishness of someone who, eager to stop the thirst of a man with dropsy, does not treat the illness, but instead gives the patient springs and rivers of water (39.2-39.4). The diatribist comments that just as the patient would burst before he stopped his thirst, so the man receiving *chremata* would not not be content, since he would be insatiate, thirsting for notoreety, and superstitious. Building on this simile, once again using the simple *dio* to effect a transition, Teles warns his listener that if one wishes to put an end to the want and need of one's son, one should not send him *pros ton Ptolemaion*, where he will acquire *alazoneian* (39.7-40.2), but one should send him to Crates (cf. Hense, "Prolegomena," p. xxxiii ff. on the date), who was able to make his students *eleutherious* and *apheleis*, even though they previously had been insatiate and extravagant. A long description of the transformation of Metrocles from an extravagant pupil of Theophrastus and Xenophon into a frugal student of Crates is inserted next by the diatribist as a "proof" of the effectiveness of Crates' teaching (40.4-41.12) and presents an "inspiring example" of the type favored by popular preachers as *actual* demonstrations of the workings of their doctrine. According to Teles, Metrocles formerly insisted on wearing a new mantle, and on having attendants, a large house, and the best food and wine, evincing the kind of behavior which was considered *eleutherios* by those *par'autois*. Lessons with Crates produced a remarkable change, however, and the young man became content with a simple life in which he wore the rough cloak of a philosopher and lived on barley-cakes and vegetables. Further, Metrocles began oiling himself with sediment in the baths, rather than with expensive oil, slept in the temples in summer and in the baths during the winter, and no longer wanted to have attendants, in which actions he, of course, resembles Diogenes of Sinope (cf. Diogenes Laertius, VI, 20-81), whose remark concerning the loss of his slave is recorded by Teles (41. 13-15).

Following his description of the "conversion" of Metrocles Teles lauches into a discussion of insatiability and dissatisfaction with one's lot. A quotation from Philemon, who observed (fr. 201 Kock, cf. Hense, p. 42, *apparatus*).

πλοῦτον μεταλήψεσθ' ἕτερον, οὐχ ἕτερον τρόπον,

is adduced to support the diatribist's contention that once you have made a man boastful, extravagant, superstitious, thirsty for notoriety, and insatiate, you accomplish nothing when you give him many possessions (41.15-42.1). After noting the impossibility of satisfying such a person Teles adds another poetic quotation, taken from Theognis this time (109, cf. Hense, p. 42, *apparatus*), which states that evil men have an *apleston noon*. The next fifteen lines are devoted to a demonstration of insatiability reduced to absurdity (which has been drawn by the author from Crates with or without the intervention of Bion; cf. Hense, p. 42, *apparatus*). Beginning with the boy who wishes that he were an *ephebe* Teles describes a spiral of ever-increasing desires (42.8-43.9) which finally can lead a man to wish to rule, then to be a king, and ultimately, even to be immortal. In a fine example of diatribal facetiousness and *spoudaiogeloion* the diatribist ends his description with the remark that if an insatiable person became immortal, he then would want to become Zeus. Two rhetorical questions, which stress that the insatiable man always is in need, introduce a further illustration of this topic, in which Teles shows that kings always are in need of more money and commit crimes rather than be deposed or administer their affairs more simply. This section (43.9-44.2), which is complementary, to the illustration that precedes it, also ends with a facetious remark as the speaker notes that if someone got the upper hand over all of such rulers, he would be en pollei adeiai and aspanistiai. As a conclusion for the portion dealing with insatiability Teles inserts a poetic fragment by Crates which illustrates the uselessness of wealth, and then putting emphasis upon the philosophical life, states that (44.7-9), "τῷ ὄντι μέγα καὶ ἀξιόλογον καὶ πήρας καὶ θέρμων καὶ λαχάνων καὶ ὕδατος <τὸ> μηδενὸς φροντίζειν, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἀθώπευτον καὶ ἀκολάκευτον."

With this remark ends the fragment which Hense has designated as IVA, but as Wilamowitz has shown (Antigonos, p. 288; cf. Hense, p. 45, apparatus; Q. Modrze, "Teles," RE Ser. 2., 5A, part I, col. 380), fragment IVB which follows it and which also deals with poverty and wealth is a continuation of the diatribal fragment preserved as the Peri Penias kai Ploutou. This fragment begins with a comment made by the shadowy interlocutor, who states that proverty is a hindrance for the pursuit of philosophy, while wealth is useful for such an occupation. Teles starts his reply (452-6) by stating ouk eu and then inquiring, "for how many men do you know who are prevented from being at leisure because of abundance or because of need? or do you not see that, for the most part, the poorest men philosophize, while the rich because of this very fact [i.e., because of their wealth] are totally occupied [i.e., en tei pasei ascholiai]." After supporting his point with a quotation from Theognis (605; cf. Hense, p. 45, apparatus), who claims that satiety has destroyed many more men than hunger has, the diatribist continues his attack upon the interlocutor's view by asking, in a facetious tone (45.8-8), "ἐπεὶ ποῦ ἂν δείξειας δι᾽ ἔνδειαν κεκωλυμένους φιλοσοφεῖν, ὥσπερ διὰ πλοῦτον"; Teles then briefly re-introduces the idea of insatiability which he discussed in fragment IVA, and, after asking whether his interlocutor does not realize that the poor are forced to be patient because of need, while the rich are compelled to be the opposite because of their wealth, adds that when men easily can obtain what they desire, they abstain from no pleasure. No proof beyond the speaker's opinion is adduced for this remark which quickly is followed by the question (46.4-6) "or do you not see that while the wealthy, who do more, are prevented from being at leisure, the poor man, who has nothing to do, can spend his time philosophizing?" This question establishes the theme for the next eighteen lines of the diatribe and abandons the idea of pleasure-seeking which Teles introduced in 46.1-4. An anecdote concerning Crates, Aristotle, and a shoemaker, next provides evidence for the speaker's contention (46.6-14), and is followed by another rhetorical question in which Teles contrasts the slaves who hautous trephousi and fulfill their misthon to their masters with the free man who cannot support himself. After claiming that the starving lelumenos has more leisure, the diatribist points out that in the present war, the rich man has to be concerned about others while the poor man, or the abios, is concerned about no one other than himself (cf. Hense, p. 47, apparatus and R. Helm, Lucian und Menipp, p. 328 and note 1). This remark is supported by a paraphrase of a quotation from Sophocles (Oedipus Tyrannus, 62-64) in which Oedipus tells his people that while their pain

XUM

comes eis hen', he himself groans for himself, for the city, and for them. Emphasizing the foolishness of the rich and powerful Teles refers to the words of Oedipus and notes that even though they see these things [i.e., the added suffering that comes with responsibility] the rich think that they are no less unhappy than they would be if they were poor, a point of view with which the diatribist obviously disagrees.

The concluding section of the Peri Penias kai Ploutou follows next (47.10-48.13) and is a passage which has special importance in a study of the generic traits of the diatribe. Within this section appears the sentence "φασὶ δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐντιμοτέρους εἶναι μᾶλλον τοὺς πλουσίους τῶν πενήτων," in which the plural phasi is used to designate an unnamed group who hold a common opinion which the diatribist will attack with illustrations showing the folly of such a point of view. Teles, of course, elsewhere (cf. 31.2, 36.6, and 45.2) has used an interlocutor who voices an opinion which the diatribists then refutes. In the passage, however, the speaker only reports the view held by some men, possibly wealthy, although one need not assume that only the wealthy hold the opinion expressed. Obviously Teles here is employing a type of imaginary interlocutor which is found in the later diatribal tradition (see above at footnotes 95 and 98) when a diatribist reports the views held by an anonymous opponent and then attempts to refute those opinions through rhetorical arguments, illustrations, or ridicule. The use of such an interlocutor or opponent did not remove from the diatribal tradition the employment of an anonymous interlocutor who actually speaks (cf. Horace, Serm. II, 3, 158-160 for example), but the utilization of remarks introduced by phesin or by phasin seems to have become the more common device (cf. footnote 95).

Teles answers his imaginary opponent in this case by adducing the example of Aristides, who was the poorest and yet the most honored of the Athenians. As the diatribist reports (47.11-48.3), Aristides was chosen to fix the amount of tribute for each city, since the Athenians thought that no one would make a more just decision. Further, the fact that Aristides' kinsman Callias was the richest man in Athens caused greater dishonor for Aristides than the poverty of Aristides caused Callias. To the example of Aristides is added that of Lysander, who was honored at Sparta despite his poverty. The diatribist next observes that one could name many others who, although they were poor, were held in greater honor than were the wealthy (48.8-10). The Peri Penias kai Ploutou (or at least its surviving fragments) then concludes with a reference to Eteocles, as the speaker paraphrases and quotes Euripides' description of the hero as a young man who was in need but held the greatest honor in the city of the Argives. All of the examples which Teles cites, of course, refute the statement made by his opponents, since those opponents have implied that wealthy men always are more honored in their cities, a position which easily can be demolished by citing even one instance which contradicts if (cf. I. M. Bockenski, Ancient Formal Logic, pp. 37 ff. on contradictories in Aristolelian logic). If the diatribist had been attempting to refute a remark concerning only some rich men, however, then the weakness of his rhetorical argument, which cites men who were not only poor but also exceptional for some other reason, would be apparent (cf. Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, 1398a33 on arguments eks epagoges, and 1401b8 ff. on arguments ek semeiou).

The above summary of the Peri Penias kai Ploutou has been given here in order to illustrate the nature of a typical diatribe written by Teles under the influence of Bion. The general impression left by these fragments is one of a medley of devices used to demonstrate a philosophical thesis and to exhort the listener to adopt the attitude toward life advocated by the speaker. Within this medley are found remarks by an interlocutor (as well as an important example of the use of phasin to designate a common opinion), rhetorical questions (cf. 33.3-4; 36.7-8; 43.7 ff.; 45.2 ff., and passim), poetic quotations inserted in order to illustrate a point, examples drawn from history (47.11-48.8) and mythology (34.6-35.4; 36.11 ff,; 48.11) anecdotes (38.4 ff.; 41.13-15; 46.6 ff.), and comparisons drawn from the animal world (34.5), from medicine (38.2 ff.), and from common knowledge (38.7). To these devices should be added the story of the "conversion" of Metrocles, the characterismos of the aneleutheros, and the rhetorical arguments which have been mentioned above. The style of the whole work, of course, is quite rhetorical and features antitheses (cf. 37.5 ff.; 45.4-5; 45.9-46.1; 46.4-5; 46.15-47.1), asyndeton (cf. 40.10 ff; 41.15 ff.; 43.4-5), polysyndeton (35.2 ff.; 35.8-10; 36.12-13), rhetorical questions (see above), isocolon (cf. 35.7; 38.5-6; 38.11-39.1), homoeoptoton (41.8-10; 45.4-5). To these stylistic traits may be added the use of rather short simple sentences (cf. Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa, I; p. 129), the employment of the second person to address an interlocutor (cf. Bultmann, p. 13), and of personifications (38.2; cf. Bultmann, p. 35).

Further, one should note that spoudaiogeloion is evident, for instance, in the example of the Phorcides (36.11 ff.), in the comparison involving a dropsical patient (39.2 ff.), in the characterismos (35.4 ff.), and in the description of the excesses of insatiability (42.8-43.9). When the major traits ennumerated above are found combined in a loose fashion (with minimal transitions) within a lecture dealing with a commonplace theme or related themes, delivered in a rhetorical style and in a tone which varies from the didactic (39.7 ff.) to polemical indignation (43.7-8) and sarcasm (43.6-7; 43.14-44.2; 44.5-6), then the work composed of these elements is a diatribe and belongs to the same genre as does the Peri Penias kai Ploutou and the other lectures by Teles and Bion.

This obvious mixture or medley was came to be known as the distribe has a form which could have influenced the development of the Saturae of Quintus Ennius," ...a miscellany, both in form and content,"[140] and also the final development of the genre of satire (by Lucilius and Horace) which also is composed of many different elements, sometimes rather loosely connected. Further, the combination of rhetorical expository sections with long sections of dialogue may support the contention of Norden and Wilamowitz that the diatribe is the result of a union of the school declamation and the genre of dialogue, although dialogue sections could have been included already in the declamation.[141]

In addition to their importance as representatives of the diatribal style, the fragments of Teles may preserve themes which were used by Bion, even though they cannot be traced directly to him. At any rate, several passages should be mentioned which deal with topics commonly found in later diatribes and other writings, and which tend to reflect Cynic doctrine, although one must be cautious in any attempt to connect with some particular school statements which are general enough to belong to several different ones. The most prevalent themes in Teles, however, all seem to be variations on the Cynic idea of autarkeia, independence or self-sufficiency. Special emphasis is placed on the uselessness of wealth and the benefits of poverty for a man who wishes to be happy and independent. In the Περὶ πενίας, for example, the listener is asked (Teles, p. 33.2), "οὐχ ὁρᾷς ἐνίους κεκτημένους μὲν πολλὰ ὡς δοκοῦσιν, οὐ χρωμένους δὲ τούτοις δι᾿ ἀνελευθερίαν καὶ ῥυπαρίαν;"[142] The Peri autarkeias, on the other hand, attempts to show the good that can come from poverty, and includes the comment (Teles, p. 13.13 ff.) ", Ἀλλ᾿ ὅμως δοκεῖ μοι ἔχειν τι ἡ πενία· δυσχερὲς καὶ ἐπίπονον· καὶ μᾶλλον ἄν τις ἐπαινέσαι τὸν μετὰ πενίας εὐκόλως <τὸ> γῆρας ἐνεγκόντα ἢ τὸν μετὰ πλούτου," although one wonders whether such praise would be a sufficient consolation. In this same section Crates and Diogenes are given as examples of men who were poor, and, of course, grew old in poverty, and yet "ἄτυφοι γενόμενοι καὶ ἐπαῖται και διαίτῃ εὐτελεῖ καὶ λιτῇ δυνάμενοι χ ρήσασθαι." No example of a virtuous rich man is given, but instead, in the Peri penias (Teles, p. 36.3-6), one finds the comment," Θᾶττον γὰρ ἂν ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ τις εἰπεῖν ὡς τὴν χρόαν, τὸ μέγεθος, [ἢ] τὴν ὄψιν μετατίθησιν ἡ τῶν χρημάτων κτῆσις ἤπερ τὸν τρόπον· ἕως δ᾿ ἂν ᾖ οὗτος ἄπληστος ἀνελεύθερος ἀλαζὼν δειλός, ἐν ἐνδείᾳ καὶ σπάνει ἔσται."[143] Perhaps the poor man has one special advantage in his search for virtue, for, according to Teles (p. 45.2-6), poverty allows one leisure to philosophize, a luxury which cannot be enjoyed by the busy rich man.[144] For some people, however, even the leisure to philosophize would be of no help, since they are restless and cannot be satisfied with anything. For example, one man who is a slave may wish to be free, but once freed, wants to be a slave again (Teles, p. 43.2 ff.). The greed of another man, on the other hand, may make him so discontended that from simple desires he progresses to more and more ambitious ones such as (p. 43.4 ff.) "...ἄρξαι, εἶτα βασιλεῦσαι, εἶτα, ὥσπερ Ἀλέξανδρος, ἀθάνατος γενέσθαι...," until finally, as, Teles notes, "εἰ δὲ καὶ τούτου τύχοι, οἶμαι, ἵνα Ζεῦς γένηται ἐπιθυμήσει."[145] The truly good man, however, is not concerned with such desires, but rather has the courage to face any circumstances and to say to Fortune " ',ἀλλ᾽ οὖν γε ἄνδρας καὶ οὐ βλᾶκα.' "[146]

In addition to these topics concerning wealth, poverty, and dissatisfaction, Teles discusses human emotions and the need for their control. For example, in the Peri apatheias (Teles, p. 56.4-7), he asks, within a long series of rhetorical questions, "ὅστις δὲ ἐν ὀδύνῃ καὶ λύπῃ [ὢν] καὶ φόβῳ ἐστί, πῶς ἂν ἐκεῖνος εὐαρεστοίη τῷ βίῳ, ἢ μὴ εὐαρεστῶν πῶς ἂν εἴη εὐδαίμων; ἢ εἰ λύπη ἅψεται, πῶς οὐ καὶ φόβος καὶ ἀγωνία καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ ἔλεος;" Happiness cannot be achieved unless one can rid himself of his emotions, which keep him in an unhappy state. Especially important is grief, since, if it is present (Teles, p. 56.13 ff.), "...πῶς ἐκτός τινος ἔσται πάθους; ἢ μηθενὸς ἐκτὸς ὢν πῶς ἀπαθὴς ἔσται; ὅπερ δεῖ τὸν μακάριον εἶναι, ὥστε οὖν μήτε ἐπὶ φίλου μήτε ἐπὶ τέκνου τελευτῇ λυπηθῆναι, εἴπερ μηδὲ ἐπὶ τῇ αὑτοῦ." Such an attitude seems harsh and impractical, despite the fact that in the next section of this fragment, emphasis is placed on one's own courage in the face of death, an attitude which public opinion expects and applauds (Teles, p. 57.1 ff.).[147]

XUM

C. The Three Aristons: Ceos, Chios and Cos

No less important than Teles in the history of the diatribe is the next writer to be discussed, Ariston of Ceos, a student of Lycon and later head of the Peripatetic school,[148] whom Strabo (X, 5.6) describes as "... ὁ τοῦ βορυσθενίτου Βίωνος ζηλωτής,"[149] and who by his very existence and his work seems to indicate that the term "Cynic-Stoic diatribe" is a misnomer. Approximately contemporary with this philosopher was the Stoic Ariston of Chios, and the similarity in the names of the two philosophers understandably has produced confusion and much scholarly debate. Because of this confusion and because the two Aristons seem to represent an important link between the Greek diatribe and later Greek and Latin prose writers, Ariston of Ceos and his contemporary Ariston of Chios must be discussed and distinguished in some detail. The starting point for any investigation of the two philosophers must be the biographical sketch of Ariston of Chios written by Diogenes Laertius (VII, 163), who gives a list of the works of Ariston of Chios, the Stoic, and then notes that Panaetius and Sosicrates attribute everything except the "Epistolon d" to Ariston the Peripatetic.[150] One, however, cannot accept this opinion completely, especially since, as Fritz Wehrli notes in his *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, VI (p. 50), Panaetius "...in Echtheitsfrage..." tends to be "Überkritisch," and probably is in this case.[151] Further, several of the works in Diogenes' list are more likely to have been written by a Stoic than by a Peripatetic. The *Pros tas Aleksinou antigraphas*, for example, seems to be a reply to an attack on Zeno of Citium, while the *Peri ton Zenonos dogmaton* may be an exposition of early Stoic doctrine.[152] To these one perhaps may add the "Protreptikon B'," citing, as evidence Sextus Empiricus, who says "καὶ

Ἀρίστων δὲ ὁ Χῖος οὐ μόνον, ὥς φασι, παρῃτεῖτο τήν τε φυσικὴν καὶ λογικὴν θεωρίαν διὰ τὸ ἀνωφελὲς καὶ πρὸς κακοῦ τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσιν ὑπάρχειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ἠθικοῦ τόπους τινὰ συμπεριέγραφεν, καθάπερ τόν τε παραινετικὸν καὶ τὸν ὑποθετικον τόπον·...," and a similar statement by Seneca (Epist. 94, 1),[153] although one could argue that such exhortations took the form of a diatribe. One also should note here that Ariston the Peripatetic could have written a *Protrepticus* following the tradition of Aristotle, founder of the Peripatetic school, and that, further, even if one assigns the protreptic work in this list to the Stoic, there is no need to assume that the Peripatetic philosopher could not have written a work of the same genre, although there would be no evidence that he did.

Another work on the list, the *Pros Kleanthen*, could be a polemic written by Ariston of Ceos, but is more likely to be a work concerning disagreements within the Stoic school. Ariston of Chios is known to have deviated from the orthodox Stoicism of Zeno by rejecting logic and physics and by arguing that "...τέλος...εἶναι τὸ ἀδιαφόρως ἔχοντα ζῆν πρὸς τὰ μεταξὺ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας μηδ᾽ ἥντινοῦν ἐν αὐτοῖς παραλλαγὴν ἀπολείποντα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπίσης ἐπὶ πάντων ἔχοντα·...."[154] Further, although no fragments survive which give evidence of a controversy involving Cleanthes and Ariston of Chios, the following information concerning Chrysippus, a student of Cleanthes, is found in Cicero, *De finibus*, IV, 25.68 (SVF, III, fr. 27):

> Cum enim, quod honestum sit, id solum bonum esse confirmatur, tollitur cura valetudinis, diligentia rei familiaris, administratio rei publicae, ordo gerendorum negotiorum, officia vitae: ipsum denique illud honestum, in quo uno vultis esse omnia, deserendum est. Quae diligentissime contra Aristonem dicuntur a Chrysippo."

In addition, Diogenes Laertius notes that Chrysippus once "...ὀνειδισθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος ὅτι οὐχὶ παρὰ Ἀρίστωνι μετὰ πολλῶν σχολάζοι",εἰ τοῖς πολλοῖς," εἶπε", προσεῖχον, οὐκ ἂν ἐφιλοσόφησα."[155] One perhaps can assume that the views of Chrysippus reflect those of his teacher, especially since Cleanthes, as an orthodox follower of Zeno, held views different from those of Ariston,[156] and was not opposed to logic, as his works Peri tou logu tria and Peri dialektikes (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 175; SVF, I, fr. 431) indicate. It does seem plausible, then, that Ariston the Stoic could have written a work criticising the views of Cleanthes and presenting his own opposing views, and that Pros Kleanthen is another work which should be attributed to the Stoic rather than to the Peripatetic philosopher.

Also to be attributed to Ariston of Chios is the treatise Pros tous dialektikous g', the thirteenth work on Diogenes' list.[157] Support for this assumption is found, of course, in the fact that this unorthodox Stoic rejected logic (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 160), while one can assume that Ariston of Ceos, as a Peripatetic, would have been a proponent of Aristolelian logic, following also the tradition of Theophrastus and Strato, who wrote treatises on the subject (Diogenes Laertius V, 42 ff. and 60 ff.). Further, as Wehrli (VI, p. 50) notes, several remarks critical of dialectic are recorded by Stobaeus as excerpts from the "Homoiomata" of Ariston (SVF, I, 352 and 391-393). That this Ariston is the Stoic has been shown convincingly by Wilhelm Knögel, in his Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem (pp. 91-92), who proves that all the quotations from Ariston found in Stobaeus, with three exceptions (SVF, I, 395, 399, 400), contain views compatible with Ariston of Chios' Stoicism.[158] The same Ariston who wrote "...οἱ ἐν διαλεκτικῇ βαθύνοντες ἐοίκασι καρκίνους μασωμένοις οἳ δ'ὀλίγον τρόφιμον περὶ πολλὰ ὀστᾶ ἀσχολοῦνται" (SVF, I, 392), then, could have written, and apparently did write, the Πρὸς τοὺς διαλεκτικοὺς γ'.

XUM

Special problems are involved in determining the author and contents of another work mentioned by Diogenes, the *Eroticai diatribai*. Athenaeus includes several quotations from a work by Ariston of Ceos possibly entitled *Peri ton erotikon homoion*, but perhaps, which is more likely, named *Erotika homoia*, although Plutarch in his life of Aristides gives another version of the title when he records a quotation "ἐξ ἐρωτικῆς ἀρχῆς" of Ariston of Ceos.[159] Concerning the *Erotika homoia*, Wehrli (VI, p. 63) states that "die Schrift könnte identisch sein mit den Ἐρωτικαὶ διατριβαὶ..., vorausgesetzt, daß diese A. [i.e. Ariston of Ceos] gehören (zu fr. 9)." An examination of the contents of the eight fragments recorded by Wehrli, however, does little to support his conclusions, if one assumes that by diatribe is meant something resembling the works of Bion and Teles, although Wehrli does not define the term. For example, the first fragment (fr. 17, p. 41) taken from Athenaeus, XIII, 564a, explains the origin of the term παιδικά, while the seventh fragment (fr. 23, p. 42) deals with sweet drinks and mentions the mixture of wine and honeycomb "...εἰς τ'αὐτὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀνθῶν εὐώδη." The remaining fragments fall into approximately the same two categories, pederasty and banquet lore. Two fragments (fr. 19 and 20, p. 41) from Plutarch, for instance, mention the rivalry that arose between Themistocles and Aristides because of their love for the same boy, Stesileos of Ceos. Further, fragment 18 (p. 41; Athenaeus, XIII, 563F) records the following word play, addressed to the fair young Dorus:

> "τὴν πρὸς Δολωνά μοι, φησί, δοκῶ παρ' Ὀδυσσέως
> ἀπάντησιν ἐπὶ σὲ μεταφέρειν (K 401)· ἦ ῥά νύ τοι
> μεγάλων Δώρων ἐπεμαίετο θυμός."

XUM

The quotation of a Homeric line, especially with the intent to create a word play, reminds one of Bion's practices, and perhaps one should consider this as an example of Ariston of Ceos' emulation of him. None of the other fragments of the *Erotika homoia*, however, bear any special resemblance to the work of Bion and some appear related to Aristotle's *Erotikos*. For example, fragment 22 (p. 42; Athenaeus, XV, 674b), which discusses the origin of the use of garlands for the head at banquets, cites as the source of information, " Ἀριστοτέλης δ'ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἐρωτικῶν καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικός, Κεῖος δὲ τὸ γένος, ἐν β' Ἐρωτικῶν Ὁμοίων....".[160] Apparently, then, or at least in so far as one can judge from eight fragments, Ariston's *Erotica Homoia* fits into a Peripatetic tradition in its subject matter, especially in its concern with the origins of words or customs, but also in its treatment of erotic material, since other Peripatetics such as Theophrastus (Diogenes Laertius V, 43: *Erotikos a'*, *Allo peri erotos a*; and V, 47: *Problemata erotika*), Demetrius of Phalerum (Diogenes Laertius, V, 81: *Erotikos*) and Heraclides (Diogenes Laertius, V, 87: *Erotikos kai Kleinias a'*.) also wrote works dealing with love.[161] Further, the word ὅμοια indicates that Ariston's work belongs in the category of classification literature which was composed in the Academy and Peripatos and concerned itself with the "ὅροι" and "διαιρέσεις" of the subject matter under discussion, attempting also to gather parallel examples, from nature or elsewhere.[162] Thus, even if one considers all the meanings of the term "diatribe" discussed earlier in this chapter and also allows for the fact that one cannot be certain about what Diogenes or his source means by "diatribai," one is forced to admit that the *Erotika Homoia* of Ariston of Ceos do not seem to be diatribes but rather, as observed above, fit into a totally different genre.

If one assumes, then, that the *Erotika homoia* are not diatribes, one still has other alternatives to consider in attempting to determine the nature of the *Erotikai diatribai* mentioned by Diogenes. First of all, there is the possibility that Diogenes' source confused the *Erotika homoia* with some work of Ariston of Chios and produced the title *Erotikai diatribai* representing, perhaps, a portion of each title. One also could theorize that the *Homoiomata* of Ariston of Chios, mentioned by Stobaeus, is the work which was confused with the *Erotika homoia*, although then one would be at a loss to explain why "διατριβαί" replaced "Ὅμοια." Since the *Homoiomata* which Stobaeus used seems to have been an epitome or a collection of apothegms put together from the work of Ariston,[163] however, one could argue that some of the quotations within this work came from diatribes written by Ariston of Chios, or that the original work of Ariston was also a collection of comparisons,[164] or even that this collection was assembled from many sources and cannot be considered at all identical with the *Erotikai diatribai*, the latter two possibilities being equally valid. Perhaps the most likely explanation for the appearance of the title on Diogenes' list is simply that Ariston of Chios wrote a work which had that title or a similar one, especially since other Stoics wrote works dealing with erotic subjects. The example from a diatribe of Zeno, quoted earlier in this chapter,[165] for instance, deals with erotic themes. Further an *erotike techne* is ascribed to Cleanthes, as well as *Diatribon duo* and a *Peri erotos* (SVF, I, fr. 481), while his student Chrysippus is credited with "ἐρωτικαῖς ἐπιστολαῖς," (SVF, II, 1072) and Sphaerus, another Stoic, wrote "διαλόγους ἐρωτικούς" and several "διατριβῶν" (SVF, I, fr. 620). There is no reason to assume, then, that Ariston could not have written the *Erotikai diatribai* and also the *Peri sophias diatribon z'* mentioned by Diogenes.[166] What these diatribes were like and whether they reflected the work of Bion[167] is a problem which cannot be solved since no definite fragments of these works of Ariston remain.

In addition to the works already discussed, a treatise *Pros tous rhetoras* is included on Diogenes' list and, of course, is one of the works attributed by Panaetius and Sosicrates to Ariston the Peripatetic. It does seem unlikely, however, that a member of a school so concerned with rhetoric and and style would write a work directed against rhetoricians. Beginning with Aristotle, who wrote a *techne rhetorike* as well as a work entitled *Peri rhetorikes e Grylos a'*[168] (Diogenes Laertius, V, 22), the Peripatos produced many rhetorical works, such as those by Theophrastus (Diogenes Laertius, V, 47-48: *Paraggelmata rhetorikes a'*; *Peri technes rhetorikes a'*; *Peri technon rhetorikon eide z'*), Demetrius of Phalerum (Diogenes Laertius, V, 80: *Peri rhetorikes a' β'*), and Heraclides (Diogenes Laertius V, 88: *Peri tou rhetoreuein e Protagoras*), and, what is even more important, a theory of style which, as developed by Theophrastus, concerned itself with purity (ὁ ἑλληνισμός), clarity (τὸ σαφές), propriety (τὸ Πρέπον), and ornamentation (ἡ κατασκευή).[169] Further, Lycon, the teacher of Ariston of Ceos is described by Cicero as "oratione locuples" (Wehrli, VI, p. 13)[170] and by Diogenes Laertius (V, 65; Wehrli, VI, p. 13) as a "...φραστικὸς ἀνῆρ καὶ περὶ παίδων ἀγωγὴν ἄκρως συντεταγμένος." Diogenes also mentions Lycon's "ἐκφραστικὸν" and notes that he was "...περιγεγωνὸς ἐν τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ..." (V, 65). Ariston himself seems to have learned some eloquence, although possibly not enough, from Lycon or from some other teacher, for Cicero (*de Finibus*, V, 5, 13; Wehrli, VI, p. 32) says of him, "concinnus deinde et elegans huius... Aristo, sed ea quae desideratur a magno philosopho gravitas in eo non fuit: scripta sane et multa et polita, sed nescio quo pacto auctoritatem oratio non habet." One might add here, admittedly using an argument *ex silentio*, that if Cicero had known of any work by Ariston which was hostile toward rhetoric or rhetoricians, he might have mentioned it in this passage or at least have reported the attitude of Ariston.

Most of the modern attempts to prove that Ariston of Ceos did write a work *Pros tous rhetoras*, however, seem to underestimate the importance of his Peripatetic background, as described above, and rely primarily on references which could be attributed to either Ariston and which do not always show a strong anti-rhetorical bias. August Mayer, for example, in his "Aristonstudien," attempting to prove that the *Pros tous rhetoras* was written by the Peripatetic and was the source of Plutarch's treatise *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae*, cites the following passage from Plutarch's treatise (804E) as an example of Ariston of Ceos' anti-rhetorical sentiments:

> οὔτε γὰρ πῦρ φησιν ὁ Αρίστων καπνὸν ποιεῖν οὔτε δόξαν
> φθόνον, ἣν εὐθὺς ἐκλάμψῃ καὶ ταχέως, ἀλλὰ τῶν κατὰ μικρὸν
> αὐξανομένων καὶ σχολαίως ἄλλον ἀλλαχόθεν ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι·
> διὸ πολλοὶ πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι περὶ τὸ βῆμα κατεμαράνθησαν.[171]

This passage, however, is not necessarily anti-rhetorical *per se*, but rather seems to be a comment on the type of politician (by necessity also an orator) who arouses envy and may succumb to it. Further, the identity of the Ariston mentioned here is not certain. Von Arnim (SVF, I, 402), in fact, includes part of this passage, from οὔτε through ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, among the fragments of Ariston of Chios, while Wehrli (VI, p. 42) lists the entire section as a fragment from a political work by Ariston of Ceos.[172] Mayer's argument does not rest entirely on this quotation, however, for he also (pp. 488 ff.) tries to establish a relationship between quotations from Ariston found in Plutarch's Themistocles, Aristides, and Demosthenes, and sections of the Praecepta gerendae reipublicae. Perhaps the most important of these quotations is that found in the Demosthenes (850c) which is attributed to Ariston of Chios (SVF, I, 381) and reads as follows:

> "Ἀρίστων δ' ὁ Χῖος καὶ Θεοφράστου τινὰ δόξαν
> ἱστόρηκε περὶ τῶν ῥητόρων. ἐρωτηθέντα γάρ, ὁποῖός τι αὐτῷ
> φαίνεται ῥήτωρ ὁ Δημοσθένης, εἰπεῖν· "ἄξιος τῆς πόλεως,"
> ὁποιος δὲ Δημάδης·" ὑπὲρ τὴν πόλιν. "Ὁ δ'αὐτὸ φιλόσοφος
> Πολύευκτον ἱστορεῖ τὸν Σφήττιον, ἕνα τῶν τότε πολιτευομένων
> Ἀθήνησιν, ἀποφαίνεσθαι, μέγιστον μὲν εἶναι ῥήτορα
> Δημοσθένην, δυνατώτατον δὲ εἰπεῖν Φωκίωνα· πλεῖστον γὰρ
> ἐν βραχυτάτῃ λέξει νοῦν ἐκφέρειν." (SVF, I, 381)

A similar account of the opinion of Polyeuctus appears in the Praecepta gerendae reipublicae (803E; cf. Mayer, p. 489), following a section criticizing a certain Democrates for making humorous remarks which were inappropriate and made him ridiculous. Mayer (pp. 488 ff.) makes the valid assumption that both of these passages have the same source, but he then says that this source is the Πρὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας by the Peripatetic Ariston and emends the Demosthenes text to read Ἀρίστων δ'ὁ Κεῖος, claiming that (pp. 488-489) not only the interest in "persönliche Details" and the dislike of Demosthenes"...sondern auch der ganze Quellenbestand der hauptsächliche aus peripatetischen Autoren (Hermipp) gearbeiteten Demosthenesvita zeigen, dass hier Theophrast nur durch den Keer benutzt worden sein kann." While Mayer's emendation may be correct,[173] his assumption that this fragment comes from a work Pros tous rhetoras seems unfounded, since only the first remark concerning Demosthenes can be considered at all anti-rhetorical, while the second remark, referring to Polyeuctus' views, could be considered complimentary. If this quotation does stem from a work by the Peripatetic, it may have belonged to a collection of opinions concerning orators, which took no stand against them as a whole. Mayer's other parallels from Themistocles (113A; Wehrli, VI, p. 41) and Aristides (319D; Wehrli, VI, p. 41) which he links (pp. 490-491) with Praecepta (807B) perhaps show that some work by Ariston of Ceos or possibly some collection of his sayings was used by Plutarch in all three of these passages, but, again, the evidence is insufficient to prove that the source used was a work Pros tous rhetoras. Therefore, one cannot use the one Ariston citation and other apparent parallels in Plutarch's Praecepta gerendae reipublicae to prove that Ariston the Peripatetic wrote a treatise Pros tous rhetoras which, moreover, would have conflicted with the general views of his own school.

If one assumes, for the reasons given above, that the Peripatetic philosopher probably did not write a treatise Pros tous rhetoras, then, one is left with the supposition that the Stoic Ariston of Chios must have written the work mentioned by Diogenes. As was the case with Ariston of Ceos, however, Ariston of Chios would have placed himself in opposition to his own school if he wrote a work directed against rhetoricians. The Stoics took an early interest in rhetoric, and, according to Cicero (De finibus, II, 17; SVF, I, 75), Zeno of Citium, the founder of the Stoic school, "...omnem vim loquendi, ut jam ante Aristoteles, in duas tributam esse partes, rhetoricam palmae, dialecticam pugni similem esse dicebat, quod latius loquerentur rhetores, dialectici autem compressius." Further both Chrysippus and Cleanthes wrote works on rhetoric, although, as Cicero notes (*De finibus*, IV, 7; SVF, II, 288), "...sic ut siquis obmutescere concupierit, nihil aliud legere debeat,"[174] and Cleanthes is known to have defined rhetoric as "...bene dicendi scientiam" (Quintilian, *Inst. Or.*, II, 15, 34-35; SVF, I, 491), while Chrysippus made a slight change to produce the definition "scientia recte dicendi" (SVF, I, 491). These and later Stoics seem to have considered rhetoric a science, that is an *episteme*, rather than an art, and to have grouped it with dialectic as another science concerned with language.[175] The purpose of the science of rhetoric was not to please the audience or to affect its emotions, but rather to instruct it,[176] a purpose which seems to be consistent with the Stoic interest in logic and dialectic, which could provide safeguards against bad or emotional judgements if properly applied (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 46-47), and also with the concept of emotion as "...ἡ ἄλογος καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ψυχῆς κίνησις ἢ ὁρμὴ πλεονάζουσα." (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 110). Further, the Stoics, being concerned with the composition of a speech as well as with its purpose (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 48), developed a theory of style, possibly "...an expansion of Theophrastus...," which advocated the use of good Greek (*Hellenismos*), clarity (*sapheneia*), brevity (*suntomia*), propriety (*prepon*), and the omission of the vulgar phrase (*kataskeuē*)(Diogenes Laertius, VII, 59).[177]

As a student of Zeno and a contemporary of Cleanthes and Chrysippus, all philosophers with attitudes favorable to rhetoric, Ariston of Chios might be expected to hold the view of rhetoric outlined above. No

XUM

assumptions based on typical Stoic doctrine, however, can be made for Ariston, the renegade Stoic, who rejected logic and physics (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 161). In fact, one might argue that since he spurned dialectic, comparing it to spiders' webs which seem to show something artistic, but which are really useless (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 161), Ariston also might have rejected the science of rhetoric, which was connected with dialectic, or at least have refused to be concerned with stylistic restrictions as outlined in Stoic doctrine, preferring to be "...πειστικὸς καὶ ὄχλῳ πεποιημένος..." (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 161), when he spoke in the Cynosarges.[178] Ariston, then, could have written a treatise *Pros tous rhetoras* which would have been directed against those of his own school or perhaps of other schools, who, in his opinion, had created another science which, like dialectic, looked artistic but was useless. An hypothesis such as this, however, rests on very tenuous evidence, and one can say with certainty only that Ariston the Stoic, rather than Ariston the Peripatetic, is the probable author of the anti-rhetorical treatise mentioned by Diogenes. Such a attribution does not carry with it the assumption that the Chian was against rhetoric as a whole or against a literary education, but only assumes that he might have rejected certain aspects of the Stoic system of rhetoric. Further, Ariston of Chios' views on poetry, which conflicted with the views of some Stoics, seem to bear out this assumption, for Ariston stressed the importance of euphony as a criterion for judging poetry, while the Stoics generally emphasized the importance of poetry for "teaching of a practical or moral kind, as if its aim were only that of presenting abstract or hidden truths."[179] This unconventional Stoic was at least consistent

XUM

enough, however, to follow a classification for poetry similar to that which he used for ethics, and to have "...assumed a classification of poems into" ποιήματα σπουδαῖα ,φαῦλα, μήτε σπουδαῖα μήτε φαῦλα...."[180] Perhaps Ariston's attitude toward rhetoric, then, followed a similar pattern, and the Chian possibly differed with other Stoics concerning the style or purpose of oratory but did not reject rhetoric as a whole.

Additional evidence which seems to indicate that Ariston the Stoic wrote some type of rhetorical work is found in the fragments of the Volumina Rhetorica of Philodemus, edited by Siegfried Sudhaus (Teubner, 1892-1896).[181] Book VII of this work contains one section which "...appears to be a discussion of the Stoic attitude toward rhetoric"[182] and another which seems to criticize Aristotle's theories concerning rhetorical proofs. Within the first of these sections appears the following reference to an Ariston (Sudhaus, I, p. 328, fr. XII, 9-12):

> π]ερ[ὶ]τῆς φιλοσοφίας|δέ τι[σ]ιν Ἀριστω[ν]εὶ|οις
> ὑπο]μνήμασιν ἐπὶ|στευεν,....[183]

This Ariston perhaps is the Chian, as Sudhaus (p. L11) thinks, since Stoic views are discussed in the fragments following it (Sudhaus, I, pp. 328-359 and SVF, III, 91-110), although Mayer (p. 522-523) thinks that the Peripatetic philosopher is meant and argues that the use of some similar arguments by Philodemus and Plutarch (in his Praecepta gerendae reipublicae) indicates that they had a common source, which he thinks was a treatise Πρὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας by Ariston of Ceos. The flaws in Mayer's basic premise have been discussed above, and must be considered to extend to this assumption by him as well.[184] One other reference to Ariston occurs in this same section of Philodemus (Sudhaus, I, p. 360, col. LXXI, 3-8) where the following comment is found,[185] apparently in the middle of a discussion concerning politics and rhetoric:

> ᾽Αλλὰ [τῶν]π[ερὶ|τούτου πλέον ἢ προσ[ῆ|κον ἴσως
> ἦν ἀπελαύ|σαμεν, εἰ καὶ μεμήκυν|τ[αι]τὸ βιβλίον
> τἀριστω|νος.

Mayer (p. 598), followed by Wehrli (X, p. 80) emends this passage by changing the work τἀριστωνος to "ζ, ᾽Αρίστω|νος," a plausible correction. In the next column after this reference to Ariston no source is named, but only the word φησίν is used (Sudhaus, I, p. 361, col. LXXII, 7 and 12) to indicate that Philodemus is quoting someone, who, according to Mayer's view (p. 522; Wehrli, X, p. 83), is Ariston the Peripatetic. As proof for his assumption Mayer cites a passage from Plutarch's Praecepta gerendae reipublicae, 801C-D (ed. C. Hubert et al, Teubner, V.1, 1960) in which the influence on persuasion exerted by eloquence combined with an orator's character is discussed, an influence which, as the author notes, plays an important role "...εἰ μὴ νὴ Δία φήσει τις, ὡς τὸν κυβερνήτην ἄγειν τὸ πλοῖον οὐ τὸ πηδάλιον καὶ τὸν ἱππέα στρέφειν τὸν ἵππον οὐ τὸν χαλινόν, οὕτως πόλιν πείθειν οὐ λόγῳ ἀλλὰ τρόπῳ χρωμένην ὥσπερ οἴακι καὶ χαλινῷ τὴν πολιτικὴν ἀρετήν...." Mayer feels that this passage comes from the same source, that is from a treatise Πρὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας by Ariston of Ceos, as the following lines found in Philodemus (Sudhaus, I, p. 361, col. LXXII, 12-18):

> "Φησὶ δὴ πρῶτον|ἀποτρέπων, ὅτι κελευ|στοῦ καὶ οὐ
> κυβερνή|του δ[ό]ξαν ἔχων ὁ ῥή|τωρ οὐκ ἄξιός ἐστι|
> προσποιεῖσθαι κυβερ|νήτης [εἶν]αι.

In addition to this text, Mayer (p. 522) quotes a later section (Sudhaus, I, p. 375, col. XCVIII) which seems to compare the danger presented by a pilot who knows "...μ[ήτε π]οῦ | μήτε πῶς μήτε [πότ]ε πλευστέον..." with an orator, since "περὶ γὰρ ὠφελίμ[ων τε|καὶ βλαβερῶ[ν] ὡς[τοι|ούτων οὐκ ἂ[ν̣ δύναιτο | παρακολουθεῖν ,[εἰ καὶ| τις αὐτὸν ἐνάρκη[σε νο|εῖν παντάπασι δ[ιδ]α[κ|τὴν τ[ὴν π]άντων [δύνα|μι]ν·...."[186] Mayer's parallels, however, are not convincing, partly because the references to a pilot seem to be commonplaces, which one seldom can use to establish a source, but primarily because the contexts of the Plutarch and Philodemus passages are too different. Plutarch is discussing the importance of eloquence combined with a speaker's character, noting that (801 C) oratory is the "συνεργὸν... πειθοῦς," when he makes the comment quoted above and thereby partly anticipates a later remark (801 E) that "οἱ μὲν οὖν τὰ πλοῖα κυβερνῶντες ἑτέροις χρῶνται κελευσταῖς, ὁ δὲ πολιτικὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ μὲν ὀφείλει τὸν κυβερνῶντα νοῦν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ δὲ τὸν ἐγκελευόμενον λόγον, ὅπως μὴ δέηται φωνῆς ἀλλοτρίας...." The first Philodemus passage, on the other hand, places the orator in a secondary position, insisting that (Sudhaus, I, p. 361, col. LXXII, 5 ff.), while it is not necessary "...παν|τελῶς ἀφι[στάν]ειν τῆς| ῥητορικῆς...| μόνον δὲ τῆς ἄ|γαν προσκαύσεως, τῆς| δὲ πολιτικῆς οὐδ' ὅ|λως....," nevertheless the orator must not consider himself in command, presumably of the state. In the second quotation from Philodemus, as given above, the author seems to emphasize the need for knowledge or experience beyond that of the technique of persuasion and uses the pilot as an example from another field.[187] Obviously Philodemus or his source has a point of view which opposes that found in the Plutarch passages. One could assume that both writers interpreted their common source in different ways or that Philodemus represents the true attitude of his source, while Plutarch in his lengthy discussion has combined his own contrary arguments with the views of his source. Such complications seem unlikely, however, and one only can assume that the pilot theme is a commonplace which happens to occur in both writers and that these passages, therefore, should not be used to establish a common source.[188]

Although Mayer's reasons for assuming that the φησίν in column LXXII (Sudhaus, I, p. 361) refers to Ariston of Ceos are not convincing, however, one should not discount the possibility that the φησίν does refer back to the Ariston mentioned in the preceding column (LXI, 7), and one also should consider the possibility that the φησίν in column LXXIII may refer to this same source. If the φησίν of column LXXIII (Sudhaus, I, p. 361, 1) does refer to Ariston, moreover, then it is possible that this Ariston is included among those, from Aristotle's school, concerning whom Philodemus says (Sudhaus, I, p. 362, col. LXXIII, 9-14), "...καί[το[ι ὅτι| ἄ]λλ[ο]ι [ṭ]ῶν ἀ[π̣' αὐ]το[ῦ] συν|έγραψαν ἐ[π']αὐτοῦ πα|νουργίαις τῶν ῥητόρων | σοφιστικῶν, εἶχον ἐ[π̣ι | δεικνύειν...." The views expressed in these two columns could have been expressed by a Peripatetic who rejected certain doctrines concerning rhetoric favored by Aristotle. For example, while the admonition to use moderation in both rhetoric and politics (Sudhaus, I, p. 361, col. LXXII, 5 ff.) is reminiscent of Aristotelian ethical doctrine, as described in the Nicomachean Ethics, II, 1106a-1109b, the suggestion of any, even partial, avoidance of politics and the hint that the orator should not take a prominent position in government seem at odds with Peripatetic views.[189] Further, the comment (Sudhaus, I, p. 361, col. LXXIII, 1-4) "φησὶν ὅλην τὴν σύστα|σιν ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ ψεύδους,|ὥστε φαίνεσθαι τῶι φι|λαληθεῖ φευκτέαν...." could be construed as an objection to the Aristolelian view, expressed in the Ars Rhetorica, I, 1355A-1355B, that rhetoric does have value when it is used in a proper way, even though some may abuse rhetoric, as they may abuse any thing else. The fact that arguments which must be directed against Aristotelian or Peripatetic doctrine occur in several columns following these (notably in columns LXXIV, LXXVI, LXXVIII and LXXXVii ff., Sudhaus, I, pp. 362 ff.) seems to indicate that column LXII marks the end of a series of arguments against Stoic views and the beginning of the attack on the Peripatetics.[190] If this section beginning at column LXII, then, represents the arguments of a Peripatetic against certain Peripatetic views, then a new problem concerning source identification has arisen. As was noted above, there is no solid evidence available to prove that Ariston of Ceos, the Peripatetic, ever wrote a work against the rhetorical views of his own school. Further, while it is possible that Ariston of Chios, the Stoic, could have written a work Pros tous rhetoras and perhaps argued in that treatise against schools other than his own, evidence for these possibilities in slim. The comment on moderation in politics, found in column LXII, may be an additional indication that the Chian, proponent of "...τὸ ἀδιαφόρως ἔχοντα ζῆν πρὸς τὰ μεταξὺ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας..." (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 160; SVF, I, 351), who claimed "φύσει γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι πατρίς, ὥσπερ οὐδ' οἶκος οὐδ' ἀγρὸς οὐδὲ χαλκεῖον,..., οὐδ' ἰατρεῖον· ἀλλὰ γίγνεται, μᾶλλον δ'ὀνομάζεται καὶ καλεῖται τούτων ἕκαστον ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸν οἰκοῦντα καὶ χρώμενον" (SVF, I, 371),[191] is not the source for the anti-Aristotelian section which follows. If it is equally unlikely, then, that Ariston the Stoic is the source for all of book VII and that Ariston the Peripatetic is the source for any of book VII, one must either assume that the name of the source for the section beginning with column LXXII, to whom the φησίν must refer, has vanished from the papyrus or else accept a more likely solution and assume, as Wehrli (X, p. 83) does, that Philodemus' actual source is a third Ariston, that is, Ariston of Cos, the Peripatetic who was associated with Critolaus.

Some evidence can be adduced to support Wehrli's plausible assumption. First of all, one finds in the fragments of Philodemus' *Hypomnematikon*, the "...precursor of the Περὶ ῥητορικῆς..." which "...was intended for private circulation, to propound to his own immediate associates at Rome his peculiar views on rhetoric...,"[192] the mangled phrase "Εἴρ]ητ[α]ι? δέ τι καὶ περὶ τ[ού|των? κα]ὶ Κριτολάωι καὶ Ἀρί[σ|τωνι]..." (Sudhaus, II, pp. 197-198, fragment IV; Wehrli, X, p. 80, fragment 5) which indicates that Philodemus at least knew of the Ariston who was associated with Critolaus, but which, of course, cannot prove by itself that Philodemus used that Ariston as a source in his larger *Rhetorica*. Further, the comments on the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy, which seems to be a major concern of book VII,[193] possibly reflect, and often seem to argue against, the opinion of Ariston of Cos, who, according to Quintilian (II, XV. 19-20; Wehrli, X, p. 79, fr. 1), defined rhetoric as "...scientia videndi et agendi in quaestionibus civilibus per orationem popularis persuasionis...," a definition which Quintilian (Ibid.) considers "...contumeliosus...adversus artem orandi, quam nihil putat doctis persuasuram." Quintilian (Ibid.) adds to his criticism of Ariston's definition the statement "illud de omnibus, qui circa civiles demum quaestiones oratorem indicant versari, dictum sit, excludi ab iis plurima oratoris officia, illam certe laudativum totam, quae est rhetorices pars tertia...." Philodemus also could have criticized Ariston for including only political oratory in his definition of rhetoric, for, according to Philodemus' opinion, political oratory was not an art and indeed

"...[καὶ τὴν τοῦ δημη|γ[ο]ρεῖν καὶ [δίκ]α[ς] λέγειν|ἐνπειρίαν ἀπό τινος τριβῆς] καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν| ἱστορίας περιγίνεσθαι πολ|λῶν ἐν τῆι πραγματείᾳ δ[ι|ασαφούντων ἀρκέσει τὰ παρὰ Μητροδώρωι σαφῶς διδά|σκοντα....". (Sudhaus, I, p. 121, col. XXI, 37-XXII, 7).[194] In contrast to political rhetoric "...ἡ σοφιστικὴ ῥητο|ρικὴ τέχνη τίς ἐστιν περί| τ̣]ε τὰς ἐπιδείξε[ι]ς, οἵας αὐ|τοὶ ποιοῦνται, καὶ τὰς τῶν | λόγων δ[ι] αθέσ[ε̣]ις, οἵων αὐ|τοὶ γράφουσίν τε [κ]αὶ σχεδι|άζουσιν...." (Sudhaus, I, pp. 122-123, col. XXII, 30-36). Perhaps, then, a remark such as "...ἀλλ' [ε]ἴ [γ]ε | τ]οὐλάχιστον δύναται| συνεργεῖν, πλήθους δύ|ναμίς ἐστιν καὶ ὀχλι|κ]ήν [τ]ινα διοικοῦσ[ιν ἱ|στορί|αν ἐν ἐκκλησίαις|καὶ δικαστηρίοις, [εἰ καὶ | ἐν τοῖς μετα[ξ]ὺ [κ]α[ιρ]ο[ῖς| οὐκ ἔ[σ]τιν α[ὐτο]ις χρεία | π]ε[ιθ]οῦ[ς· διὸ οὐ]δε τέχνη [ἐστὶ[ν...." (Sudhaus, I, pp. 363-364, col. LXXVI, 4-14), represents an argument against Ariston's view of rhetoric, while the comparison of the pilot and the orator (Sudhaus, I, p. 375, col. XCVIII), as quoted above in the discussion of Philodemus and Plutarch, shows the opinion of Philodemus that rhetoric or persuasion by itself is not sufficient for a political career (cf. Sudhaus, I, p. 379, column CIV and p. 385, fr. G, 1-5).[195]

Perhaps the strongest argument which can be adduced in favor of Ariston of Cos as a source for Philodemus' Rhetorica, however, is one based on chronology, rather than on doctrine. As Wehrli has observed (X, p. 83) "wie immer nämlich der Chier sich zur Rhetorik verhalten haben mag, so kann er aus chronologischen Gründen nicht am von Karneades und Kritolaus neu eröffneten Kampf gegen die Rhetorik beteiligt gewesen sein, an welchem Philodem sich ausschliesslich orientiert." Both Critolaus the Peripatetic and Carneades the Academic seem to have argued that rhetoric was not an art,[196] an opinion with which, as has been seen Philodemus would agree in the case of all forms of rhetoric except the sophistic or epideictic. In the text of Philodemus' *Rhetorica*, Critolaus is mentioned several times (Wehrli, X, pp. 54-55, fr. 27-31; p. 57, fr. 35 and 36; p. 58, fr. 38 and 39), including one fragment which mentions the "...τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας|φιλοτιμία[ν]" (Wehrli, X, p. 54, fr. 29) of Critolaus, a fact which seems to indicate that Philodemus may have used some work of Critolaus as a source or have taken his material at second hand, perhaps from a work by Ariston of Cos, the pupil of Critolaus, who, if Quintilian's report is to be trusted, must have disagreed with his teacher concerning the definition of rhetoric as a *scientia* or τέχνη. The references to Critolaus, the mention of Critolaus and Ariston together (Sudhaus, II, pp. 197-198, fr. IV), and the content of Philodemus' arguments seem to indicate that the third and latest Ariston, Ariston of Cos, who could have known and used the arguments of contemporary Peripatetics, Academics, and Stoics, is a likely source for at least part of the seventh book of Philodemus' *Rhetorica*, although, again, one cannot be certain on the basis of such fragmentary evidence.[197] Further, it is possible that Ariston of Cos is the author of the *Pros tous rhetoras* listed by Diogenes Laertius, although perhaps one should not assume a triple confusion on the part of Panaetius and Sosicrates.

The remaining works on Diogenes' list offer less cause for controversy than those works which already have been discussed, although one cannot assign all of them definitely to one particular Ariston. The Hypomnematon κε', and the *Hypomnemata hyper kenodoksias*, for example, which belong to that genre which G. C. Fiske (*Lucilius and Horace*, p. 157) describes as consisting of "...virtually the notebooks of writers and philosophers, not designed for publication until they have been revised...," could have been the work of either a Stoic or a Peripatetic, and, indeed, members of both schools are known to have produced such "notebooks."[198] Also not to be confined to one school are the *Chreion ia'*, apparently a collection of anecdotes, such as those mentioned above in the discussion of Bion, which were used frequently, but not exclusively, by Cynics and Stoics.[199] Diogenes Laertius mentions the *chreia* among the works of the Stoics Zeno (VI, 91), Persaeus (VII, 36), as well as a *Peri chreion* by Cleanthes (VII, 174), and in addition lists *chreion a'* among the works of the Peripatetic Demetrius of Phalerum (V, 81). Perhaps Ariston the Stoic is the more likely author of the *Chreion ia'* listed by Diogenes, but one cannot prove, on the basis of existing evidence, that he is the actual author. Another doubtful work on Diogenes' list is the *Apomnemoneumaton g'*, which must be reports "...upon the acts, noteworthy incidents, or speeches of a master made by a pupil on the basis of personal recollections or oral tradition," and which belongs to a genre begun by Xenophon with his "recollections of Socrates."[200] Among the Stoics, both Zeno (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 4; SVF, I, fr. 41; *apomnemoneumata Kratetos ethika*; cf. Fiske, Lucilius and Horace, p. 156) and Persaeus (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 36; SVF, I, fr. 435) are known to have written *apomnemoneumata*, but no reference to this type of work by a Peripatetic (with the exception of Ariston) is preserved by Diogenes Laertius, a fact which does not allow one to assume that the Peripatetics never kept such records. The weight of the evidence, slight as it may be, seems to indicate, however, that Ariston of Chios is the author of the *Apomnemoneumaton g'*.[201]

XUM

Apparently more easily assigned to a specific author are the *Dialogoi* on Diogenes' list, since the dialogue form frequently was used by Academics and Peripatetics following the example of Plato or Aristotle,[202] while among the Stoics only Persaeus (Athenaeus, IV, 162B; SVF, I, fr. 452), Sphaerus (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 177; SVF, I, fr. 620) and Herillus (SVF, I, fr. 409) have dialogues included in their lists of writings. One therefore might argue that Ariston of Ceos is more likely to have written dialogues than is Ariston of Chios. Evidence which seems to support this argument is found in Plutarch's treatise *de audiendis poetis* (*Moralia* 14E; Wehrli, VI, p. 43, fr. 33) where the following comments appear:

> ὅτι δὲ τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λεγομένων οἱ σφόδρα νέοι τοῖς μὴ δοκοῦσι φιλοσόφως μηδ' ἀπὸ σπουδῆς λέγεσθαι χαίρουσι μᾶλλον καὶ παρέχουσι ὑπηκοους ἑαυτοὺς καὶ χειροήθεις, δῆλόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν. οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὰ Αἰσώπεια μυθάρια καὶ τὰς ποιητικὰς ὑποθέσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ἄβαριν τὸν Ἡρακλείδου καὶ τὸν Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀρίστωνος διερχόμενοι τὰ περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν δόγματα μεμειγμένα μυθολογίᾳ μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐνθουσιῶσι.

The fact that the *Lycon* of Ariston is listed along with the *Abaris* of Heracleides Ponticus, who is well-known for his dialogues,[203] would seem to indicate that this work is also a dialogue and probably was written by Ariston the Peripatetic in honor or, as is very probable, in memory of his teacher Lycon, who may have been the main speaker or subject.[204] Further, the inclusion of the *Abaris* and *Lycon* with works which combine mythology with teachings concerning the soul may indicate that these two works also concerned the soul, an appropriate topic for a memorial work such as

XUM

the Lycon seems to be.[205] On the basis of this Plutarch passage, then, and in consideration of the Peripatetic tradition of dialogues, one tentatively may ascribe to Ariston of Ceos the dialogues listed by Diogenes.

Further support for this ascription seems to come from the following passage of Cicero's De senectute (I, 3; Wehrli, VI, p. 32, fr. 12) which apparently refers to a dialogue by the Peripatetic:

> hunc librum ad te de senectute misimus. omnem
> autem sermonem tribuimus non Tithono ut Aristo
> Ceus, parum enim esset auctoritas in fabula, sed
> M. Catoni seni, qua maiorem auctoritatem haberet
> oratio.

As André Oltramare has observed, however, the assumption that the Cean is Cicero's source "...ne résiste ni à l'examen des manuscrits (le Leidensis porte "Chius"), ni à l'étude comparative des textes."[206] A comparative study of Cicero's de senectute and Plutarch's an seni sit gerenda res publica, undertaken by Charles Fornara, and Oltramare's investigations of Cicero's de Senectute and Tusculan Disputations, in fact, convincingly show that the Stoic is the author of the Tithonus and include some important points which must be mentioned briefly here. First of all, the assumption that a common source was used by both Cicero and Plutarch in their essays concerning old age generally is accepted and seems to be supported by the "common elements" found in both works and, less surely, by the following statement, found in Plutarch's essay 792 E (ed. C. Hubert et al., Teubner, V. 1, 1960), which may be taken as a somewhat veiled reference to the Tithonus of Ariston:

> εἰ γοῦν πατέρα τὸν Τιθωνὸν εἶχες, ἀθάνατον μὲν ὄντα
> χρείαν δ'ἔχοντα διὰ γῆρας ἀεὶ πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας, οὐκ
> ἂν οἶομαί σε φυγεῖν οὐδ'ἀπείπασθαι τὸ θεραπεύειν καὶ
> προσαγορεύειν καὶ βοηθεῖν ὡς λελειτουργηκότα πολὺν
> χρόνον·....[207]

As Fornara observes, however, despite their similarities, these two works have differences which show that their authors are pursuing different goals. While Cicero, on the one hand, wants to "...lighten the press of age by adducing its pleasurable and consolatory features (of which only some few are connected with political activity), and to that end he unites Peripatetic and Stoic doctrine...," Plutarch, on the other hand, "...is solely concerned to answer affirmatively the question which appears as the title of his essay, and he lets fly at a Stoical opponent with Peripatetic arguments."[208] These differences do not affect the theory of a common source, but rather show that both writers were familiar with the doctrines of both schools.[209] Further, since the source whom Plutarch attempts to refute seems to have taken a stand on the participation of an old man in politics which is at variance with the usual views of the Peripatos concerning the politikos aner,[210] Plutarch's opponent is not likely to be the Peripatetic Ariston of Ceos, but rather must be the Stoic Ariston of Chios, whose concept of "the adiaphora," which was mentioned above, would have allowed him to argue that participation in politics is not always to be preferred to non-participation.[211] In addition the attitude of Plutarch's opponent seems to reflect the view of a statement found in Bion, who warns, "γέρων γέγονας·μὴ ζήτει τὰ τοῦ νέου· ἀσθενὴς πάλιν·μὴ ζήτει τὰ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ...," (Teles, p. 10. 6-7), an attitude which is not at variance with Cicero's goals, as mentioned above, and which, when considered along with the fragment of Crates found in Teles and discussed above (Teles, p. 49-51), seems to reflect the Cynic view of old age.[212] Ariston of Chios, because of his concept of "ta adiaphora" which admittedly at least reflects the Cynic ideals of apathy and independence,[213] and because of his rejection of the study of logic and physical science, seems to have been, as Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has said, "...mehr Kyniker als Stoiker...," and thus also could have shared this Cynic attitude toward old age and have included it in a work which became a source for both Cicero and Plutarch. Further evidence to support the view that Ariston of Chios wrote the Tithonus lies in the fact that other Stoics, such as Persaeus (SVF, I, fr. 435: θυέστης) and Herillus Carthaginiensis (SVF, I, fr. 409: ʽΕρμῆς ; Μήδεια), seem to have written works which belong to the same genre as the Tithonus, which Fornara calls "an essay in mythological dress,"[214] but which must be considered some type of dialogue or monologue, in view of Cicero's statement, featuring Tithonus as the main speaker, with an interlocutor present only to establish a setting and begin the discussion, as Scipio and Laelius do in the De senectute, or as the only speaker, a possibility which must be noted in view of the fact that Diogenes Laertius (VII, 166; SVF, I, fr. 409) mentions "διάλογοι" in addition to the ʽΕρμῆς and Μήδεια in his list of the works of Herillus. Therefore, because of the appearance of a figure from mythology as a speaker, and since the apparent views of Plutarch's opponent who also seems to be Cicero's source, do not seem to be in keeping with the likely attitude of a Peripatetic philosopher, but rather are compatible with the unorthodox attitudes of Ariston of Chios, especially in view of his tendencies toward Cynic doctrine, one must assume, as Fornara does, that the Stoic philosopher is the author of the Tithonus mentioned by Cicero.[215] Further, if, as seems likely, the Tithonus is a dialogue of some sort, then one must assume that the Dialogoi mentioned by Diogenes Laertius can refer to the works of either Ariston or else that a dialogue or monologue featuring a mythogical character is a special type, and, as in the case of the listing of the works of Herillus, is considered as something outside of the general term διάλογοι. The evidence available, however, allows one only to make conjectures such as these and cannot provide certainty.

The problems connected with the determination of the author of the *Tithonus* led Oltramare (pp. 119 ff.) into a discussion of the diatribal elements found in Cicero's *de Senectute*, which, in Oltramare's view, made the Stoic the likely author, although, as the work of Wilhelm Knögel (Der *Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*) has shown, the diatribal styles was used also by Ariston of Ceos in a work which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Only one additional work mentioned by Diogenes Laertius in his biography of Ariston of Chios remains to be discussed and, entitled *Scholon s'*, seems to be a collection of declamations or lectures which may resemble or, in the opinion of some scholars, be identical with the diatribe.[216] Evidence useful for determining the nature of the *schola* is found in several passages of Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*.[217] First, the following lines (III, XXXIV. 81; ed. M. Pohlenz, 1918, rep. 165, Teubner), found in a section filled with Cynic and Stoic commonplaces (III, XXXIV. 81-84), seem to lend weight to the theory which assumes that the *schola* and the diatribe are identical or similar genres:

> Sunt enim certa quae de paupertate, certa quae de vita inhonorata et ingloria dici soleant: separatim certae scholae sunt de exsilio, de interitu patriae, de servitute, de debilitate, de caecitate, de omni casu, in quo nomen poni solet calamitatis. Haec Graeci in singulas scholas et in singulos libros dispertiunt; opus enim quaerunt: quamquam plenae disputationes delectationis sunt.

The phrase "...in singulas scholas et in singulos libros..." may indicate that the author is referring to two separate genres, the *schola*, which style

XUM

to have been a type of declamation, and the consolatio, which seems to have been an essay, or brief treatise, such as the Peri penthous of Crantor of Soli, intended to bring comfort to someone who had suffered some misfortune (cf. E. J. Kenney, op. cit.,in footnote 6, p. 32), although Cicero may have used libros to indicate collections of scholas. Of chief importance for this discussion, however, are the actual topics mentioned, for themes concerning exile, slavery, weakness, and other troubles commonly are dealt with in diatribes such as, for example, Teles Peri phyges (pp. 21 ff.) or his Peri autarkeias (pp. 5 ff.) which stresses independence even in misfortune. The genre of diatribe, however, is not concerned primarily with consolation,[218] but rather with exhortation, urging one to eschew certain vices or mistaken notions and to follow a life of virtue as defined by the author of the diatribe who himself adopts a polemical rather than a consolatory tone. Further, diatribal topics are not limited to those concerning misfortunes, for one finds in the fragments of Teles diatribes dealing with pleasure (p. 49 ff.) and with the suppression of emotions (p. 55 ff.), as well as one fragment entitled Peri tou dokein kai tou einai. Thus, on the basis of the themes in the Ciceronian passage quoted above, one cannot state that the diatribe and the schola are the same thing.

It is possible, however, that the schola is not limited to the discussion of misfortunes. In another section of the Tusculan Disputations (I, IV.7) Cicero says, "hanc enim perfectam philosophiam semper indicavi, quae de maximis quaestionibus copiose posset ornateque dicere, in quam exercitationem ita nos studiose dedimus, ut iam etiam scholas Graecorum more habere auderemus: ut nuper tuum post discessum in Tusculano, cum essent complures mecum familiares, temptavi quid in eo genere possem. Ut enim antea declamitabam causas, quod nemo me diutius fecit, sic haec mihi nunc senilis est declamatio." Cicero took his subject matter for these declamations, as he says, "...de quo quis audire vellet: ad id aut sedens aut ambulans disputabam...," and, in that way completed "...dierum quinque scholas, ut Graeci appellant, in totidem libros...." G. Reichel, in his _Quaestiones_ _Progymnasticae_ (dissertation, Leipzig, 1909; p. 106), observes that the difference between _sedens_ and _ambulans_ in this passage is one of "...dua disputandi rationes..." with _ambulans_ looking "...magis ad philosopham disciplinam...," while _sedens_ refers to the practice followed by those students "...in schola rhetorica de quaestionibus egerunt."[219] This interpretation seems rather forced, however, especially since Cicero gives the following description of his method (I, IV.8) without hinting at any distinction such as Reichel makes:

> Fiebat autem ita, ut, cum is, qui audire vellet, dixisset quid sibi videretur, tum ego contra dicerem. Haec est enim, ut scis, vetus et Socratica ratio contra alterius opinionem disserendi....Sed quo commodius disputationes nostrae explicentur, sic eas exponam, quasi agatur res, non quasi narretur.

From Cicero's explanation one must draw the conclusion that the _schola_ cannot be the same thing as the diatribe as composed by Bion and his successors,[220] which was intended to reach and interest groups of average people rather than a few educated men who were interested in philosophical discussion. The _schola_, further, must belong to an altogether different genre or else form a separate branch of the same genre to which the diatribe belongs. The latter possibility is extremely likely if one includes both types of literature in the division of rhetoric known as epideictic, since neither form can be classed as judicial or as forensic, even though they may involve deliberation concerning a philosophical point. Further, if one considers the nature of the five discussions found in the *Tusculan Disputations*, the relationship between diatribe and *schola* can be established on a more certain basis. Each book of this work by Cicero contains a discussion of a different philosophical theme. For example, the conversation in Book I opens with the comment (I, V.9) "malum mihi videtur esse mors," which forms part of the theme of the following discussion of death, while in Book IV (IV.8) one of Cicero's interlocutors sets the topic by stating, "non mihi videtur omni animi perturbatione posse sapiens vacare." These themes and the topics of the other three books all can be described as θεωρητικαὶ θέσεις[221] or *quaestiones* and, as part of the "oratoris materiam," belong to that form of topic "...quae habeat in se controversiam in dicendo positam sine certarum personarum interpositione, ad hunc modum: 'Ecquid sit bonum praeter honestatem?' 'Verine sint sensus?' 'Quae sit mundi forma?' 'Quae sit solis magnitudo?'"[222] Apparently at first belonging chiefly to the philosophical schools, the *thesis* was defined by Aristotle in his *Topica* I, XI (104B19) as "...ὑπόληψις παράδοξος τῶν γνωρίμων τινὸς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν..." which also (104B24) may concern something about which one has as "...λόγον...ἐναντίον ταῖς δόξαις, οἷον ὅτι οὐ πᾶν τὸ ὂν ἤτοι γενόμενόν ἐστιν ἢ ἀΐδιον, καθάπερ οἱ σοφισταί φασιν·....".[223] As S. F. Bonner notes, in his *Roman Declamation* (p. 2)," the paradoxical element survives in the essays of Cicero entitled *Paradoxa Stoicorum*....". The *thesis* in general, however, as described by Cicero in his *de Inventione* (I, vi.8), seems to have lost "the paradoxical element" and to have become a "πρόβλημα" to be discussed, although the speaker or interlocutors conceivably could argue in favor of a solution at variance with standard opinions.[224]

XUM

The connection between the philosophical thesis and rhetoric seems to have begun early, for, according to Cicero (*Orator*, 14.46), "...haec igitur quaestio a propriis personis et temporibus ad universi generis orationem traducta appellatur θέσις. in hac Aristoteles adulescentis non ad philosophorum morem tenuitur disserendi, sed ad copiam rhetorum, in utramque partem ut ornatius et uberius dici posset, exercuit idemque locos - sic enim appellat - quasi argumentorum notas tradidit unde omnis in utramque partem traheretur oratio....,"[225] a description which reminds one of Cicero's comments on the *schola*, in the *Tusculan Disputations* (I, IV.7). By the second century B.C., however, many philosophers, notably Carneades the Academic, Critolaus the Peripatetic, and Diogenes the Stoic, turned against rhetoric as it was being taught and practiced at the time and resented the use to which *theses* were being put by rhetoricians who "...considered the question only as a problem with a rhetorical response, not as an exposition of a truth....,"[226] and who therefore seemed likely to turn the discussion of *theses* into superficial exercises concerned with form and persuasive power but not with the content. Cicero also, in his early work *De inventione*, argues against the use of *theses* by the rhetorician, and comments (I, VI.8) that they are removed "...procul ab oratoris officio..." and that "...quibus in rebus summa ingenia philosophorum plurimo cum labore consumpta intelligimus, eas sicut aliquas parvas res oratori attribuere magna amentia videtur....," expressing an opinion which he later changed in favor of the discussion of philosophical topics,[228] such as those in the *Tusculan Disputations*. Since the discussions in the *Tusculan Disputations* involve the argument

XUM

of theses and since Cicero so plainly describes his original efforts as scholas which represent his "senilis...declamatio," one may assume that the schola must be a speech in which a philosophical thesis is developed and argued in the manner described by Cicero. From the term itself, which, of course, can refer to a school, and from the private nature of Cicero's efforts as described in his introductory remarks (I, IV.7-8), one also may be justified in assuming that schola, unlike diatribe, is a term used to refer to a speech on a philosophical topic delivered within a philosophical school, or, as in Cicero's work, in the presence of a few interested acquaintances. Further, there does not seem to be sufficient justification for limiting the topics of the schola to consolatory themes, since one must remember that Cicero, writing after the death of his daughter,[228] naturally would turn to philosophical themes concerned with calamity and consolation and list those as topics of the schola, even though the schola itself could have been a form which included any philosophical topic and indeed probably was identical with the thesis (which was a term used not only to indicate the topic of a speech but also the speech itself).[229] If it is identical with the thesis or even if it is a speech dealing only with consolatory theses, then the schola can be considered a form related to the diatribe, which also seems to have made use of theses[230] and which is perhaps best described as a popularized form of the thesis delivered in a polemical manner and influenced by the practices of the rhetorical schools. Hermann Throm, in his Die Thesis (Rhetorische Studien, 17, Paderborn, 1932; p. 191), in fact, goes so far as to say that diatribes "...nicht anderes als ethische, besonders paränetische Theseis sind...," a description which is quite fitting if one adds to it the fact that the diatribe is a popularized form of the *thesis* intended for an audience made up of the general populace. Since not all *theses* are diatribes, however, one should not abandon the term "diatribe" in favor of the term *thesis* as a descriptive name for the type of work produced by Bion and others. One also cannot assume that *schola* and diatribe are interchangeable terms, but must grant to them the slight differences noted above, especially since the *Tusculan Disputations*, despite the presence of elements of the diatribal style in some sections,[231] features a seriousness and depth of thought and style which would be unacceptable in the less-sophisticated diatribe.

Now that the term *schola* has been defined and distinguished from the diatribe, one must return to the consideration of the σχολῶν ς' mentioned by Diogenes Laertius in his life of Ariston of Chios, and attempt to decide which Ariston is the author. Cicero's comments on the *schola*, as quoted above, are of little help, since he attributes the form to the Greeks in general, and the reference to Socrates, from whom many schools could claim descent, does nothing to limit the genre to Academics, Peripatetics, Stoics, or others. Further, Diogenes Laertius mentions *Ethikon scholon* a' (V, 47) by Theophrastus the Peripatetic and quotes from "...ταῖς ἠθικαῖς σχολαῖς..." (VII, 28; SVF, I, fr. 458) by Persaeus the Stoic. These references, obviously, are of no help in distinguishing between the two Aristons. Possible evidence in support of the composition of *scholas* by the Stoic, however, is found in Seneca's *Epistulae Morales*, 94.1-2 (ed. L. D. Reynolds, II, Oxford, 1965, rep. 1969; cf. H. Throm, *Die Thesis*, pp. 145-146). After mentioning "...eam partem philosophiae quae dat propria cuique personae praecepta nec in universum componit hominem...," Seneca makes the following statements concerning Ariston of Chios:

XUM

> Ariston Stoicus e contrario hanc partem levem existimat et quae non descendat in pectus usque, anilia habentum praecepta; plurimum ait proficere ipsa decreta philosophiae constitutionemque summi boni....

The Roman philosopher's remarks indicate that Ariston preferred the kind of topic which would have been developed in a philosophical thesis or schola, but they do not prove that the Stoic used the genre or, of course, that the Peripatetic philosopher did not. Further, Seneca's comments should not be assumed to prove that Ariston of Chios could not have written diatribes, for the diatribe, as a form of thesis, also deals with broad typics, such as apatheia or independence, even though it takes its examples from daily life (cf. Seneca's remarks in section 5 ff. on the position of men like Ariston and Cleanthes). The evidence from the Epistulae Morales, then, is of no help in eliminating one Ariston in favor of the other, and one only can state that either philosopher could have written scholas.

One final work[232] by one of the Aristons remains to be investigated and has special importance since it seems to be the source of the tenth book of Philodemus' Περὶ κακιῶν, a book which concerns "ὑπερηφανία." Philodemus states in the tenth column of book ten (Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13, I; Knögel, p. 8),[233] "᾿Αρίστων το[ί]νυν [γ]ε[γρ]α̣φῶς περὶ τοῦ κο̣[υ]φίζ[ειν ὑ]περηφανίας ἐπιτο[μὴν τὸ ἴ]διον μὲν ἔβ̣λ̣ε̣π̣εν [τῶν] διὰ τύχην ὑπ[ε]ρηφ[ά]νων [μόν]ων...."[234] As Knögel indicates (pp. 9-10) in his discussion of this passage, the term epitome can be used to designate a "kurze Darstellung" of some doctrine, in this case of the "Hauptgesichtspunkte" of Ariston concerning pride, and therefore can indicate a short work written by an author, and need not refer to a summary of his work compiled by someone else.[235] Ariston's epitome, then probably contained a brief account of his views on pride, apparently developed as a result of his own experience,

XUM

as Philodemus' comments show, and intended as a warning to others.[236] The περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας ἐπιτομής however, does not seem to be the only work of Ariston from which Philodemus drew material for the *Peri kakion* X, for the sections of the treatise which are derived from Ariston, as Knögel (p. 16) observes without drawing any conclusions, can be separated into two parts, the first concerning ὑπερηφανία and including columns X30-XVI 33, and the second, comprising columns XVI, 33 - XXIV, dealing with a variety of character types such as, first, the αὐθάδης (col. XVI, 35-SVII, 17 and XIX, 2-17), the αὐθέκαστος (XVII, 17-XVIII, 11 and XIX, 17-XX, 3), the παντειδήμων (XVIII, 11-XIX, 2 and XX, 3-32), followed in columns XX, 32-XXI, 37 by the ὑπερόπτης, σεμνοκόπος, and the βρενθυόμενος, and concluding with the εἴρων (XXI, 37-XXIII, 37) and the εὐτελιστή (XXIV).[237] Obviously, most of these character types would be out of place in a work devoted only to ὑπερηφανία, and, further, the section in which they occur differs, as Wehrli (VI, p. 54) observes, "...thematisch und formell von jenem ersten Teil."[238] Wehrli (VI, p. 54) seems to be correct in assuming, then, that Philodemus used not only an *epitome* concerning *hyperephania* by Ariston, but also a second work, by the same author, which Wehrli designates as a "Characterologie," and which must have been a collection of character descriptions similar to the *Charakteres ethikoi* of Theophrastus which contained sketches of types such as the *authades*, the *eiron*, and the *hyperephanos*.[239] Further, as a result of Knögel's analysis of the Peripatetic elements in the Ariston sections of Philodemus' *Peri kakion* X, there seems to be no doubt that Ariston of Ceos must be the author of the *epitome* and of the "Characterologie" from which Philodemus drew material.[240]

XUM

In contrast to the other surviving fragments of Ariston the excerpts preserved in Philodemus' Peri kakion X are large enough to allow one to analyse the style of the Peripatetic philosopher. Knögel has undertaken such an analysis and has shown that Ariston's fragments contain sufficient elements of the diatribal style to justify Strabo's comment, quoted earlier,[241] that Ariston of Ceos was an imitator of Bion of Borysthenes. Some of Knögel's results must be included here to illustrate the importance of Ariston in the development of the diatribe. First of all, one finds within these fragments anecdotes and comparisons, two forms of illustration occurring regularly in Bion. Ariston recounts episodes concerning, for instance, Dion (Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13 II; Knögel, p. 56), Pericles (Wehrli, ibid.; Knögel, p. 57), Alexander (Wehrli, VI, p. 34, fr. 13 IV; Knögel, p. 57), and Timocreon (Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 V; Knögel, p. 56), among others. These anecdotes are of varying length, with some containing direct speech (reminiscent of the style of Bion in his anecdotes concerning Socrates and Xanthippe, Teles, pp. 18 ff.), while others only briefly describe some activity.[242] Comparisons also vary in length and subject matter and include a reference to envy as "...ὀ]φθαλμία τίς ...ψυχῆς" (Wehrli, VI, p. 34, fr. 13 III; Knögel, p. 34 under "Vergleich der Laster der Seele mit den Krankheiten des Körpers"), and a comparison of men to young children (Wehrli, VI, p. 37, fr. 14 III; Knögel, p. 58). The quotation of verse in a prose discussion, another trait common in the diatribe, occurs twice in the Ariston fragments, once with the citation of a line from Euripides (fr. 420) which appears in an ancedote concerning Dionysios (Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13 II; Knögel, p. 56), and a second time in a quotation from Aristophanes (Nub. 362; Wehrli, VI, p. 39, fr. 14 VI; Knögel, p. 56) which is used to illustrate the character type known as the *brenthuomenos* (Wehrli, VI, p. 38, fr. 14 VI). Equally indicative of diatribal influence are the frequent rhetorical questions, the occasional address to the listener or reader, and the use of direct speech in anecdotes (such as Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13 II, 20-21; cf. Knögel, p. 55) and especially in character sketches (such as Wehrli, VI, pp. 39-40, fr. 14 VIII; cf. Knögel, p. 56). In fragment 14 V (Wehrli, VI, p. 38, fr. 14 V, 14; Knögel, p. 55), for example, is found the question "...τὶ γὰρ δεῖ τἆλλα περὶ ληρούντων λέγειν;", which abruptly interrupts a statement by the author. Questions also are attributed to various character types, such as the *eiron* (Wehrli, VI, p. 39, fr. 14 VII; Knögel, p. 55) who asks a series of questions in a manner reminiscent of the groups of rhetorical questions found in Bion and Teles.[243] Another form of interrogation features the imagined reader or listener, typical of the diatribe, who is not named or described but merely addressed or exhorted to do something. An example of this device is given by Knögel (p. 56), who cites the following passage (Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 VI, 20 ff.) as a question asked of the reader:

> καὶ πολλάκις ἑαυτὸν ἐπερωτᾶν: "τί με [τὸ] γαυριᾶν
> ποιοῦν καὶ ὑπερηφανεῖν; ὅτι κερμάτια κέκτημαι πλεῖονα;
> ἀλλ᾽ὅτι ν[ọṃ]ίζ[ο]μαι τῶν εὐγενῶν ἤτοι στρ[α]τηγούντων
> καὶ τιμωμένω[ν] ἐνιαυσίᾳ περιβολῇ χλαμύδος;"[244]

Ariston also seems to address his listener directly through the use of infinitives employed as imperatives, as in the following section (Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13 II):

> [κ]αὶ ὅταν ἐπὶ τὰς εὐκ[λ]η̣ρίας ἐφιστάνη̣, μὴ προσεπιρητορε̣ύ̣[ε̣ι̣ν]
> αὐταῖς πρὸς τὸ μεῖ[ζ]ον, [ἀλλ᾽]ἀπ[ο]σπᾶν ὅτι δύναται,
> κουφίζε[ιν]τῆς ἰσχνότητος πεφυκ[υίας?]....

In Knögel's opinion (p. 13) these infinitives do not have an imperative meaning, but rather show that Philodemus "die Worte Aristons in indirekter Rede wiedergibt,...," a conclusion which seems to be supported by the fact that in the second part of the *Peri kakion* X, where his source is the "Characterologie," Philodemus quotes Ariston directly "...ohne jede Kürzung..." and also without the use of such infinitives. One should not discount the possibility, however, that Ariston used exhortatory infinitives in his *epitome* but not in his character sketches, and that, therefore, only the first half of the *Peri kakion* X contains such infinitives, just as it also contains all of the anecdotes, a fact which further illustrates the differences in the form of the two sections. A comment such as "ἐννοιεῖν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπιχαιρεκακίαν, ὅταν εἰς ἀτυχίαν μεταπέσῃ·..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 34, fr. 13 III), then, may well be meant in an imperative sense and may indicate that the *epitome* was a work which had a tone similar to that of the typical diatribe.[245]

One additional and very important trait of the diatribe style is the tone of *spoudaiogeloion* (which Knögel does not mention), characteristic of Bion's work, but seldom noticeable in the fragments of Ariston. In some of the anecdotes included by Ariston one, perhaps, may discern traces of a type of sarcastic or wry humor. Dionysios, for example, answers the man who says "'οἰμώξῃ Διονύσιε,'" with the comment, "'σὺ μὲν οὖν, [ἀπήν̣]τησεν, εἰ μὴ τὸ ἡμίσυ τῆς [ὑπο]θήκης ἐπανοίσεις,'" (Wehrli, VI, p. 34, fr. 13 IV, 19-20). Further, in the character sketches, the ridiculous actions of the

XUM

panteidemon, who tries to do everything alone, including treating the illnesses of his own slaves (Wehrli, VI, p. 37, fr. 14 III, 9 ff.), and the follies of the eiron (Wehrli, VI, pp. 39-40, fr. 14 VIII) are capable of provoking a bitter smile.[246]

In addition to the stylistic traits mentioned above, one finds in the fragments of Ariston preserved by Philodemus many of the figures of speech commonly used in the diatribe. Antithesis, for example, is employed in the statement "ὡς καὶ περικλης ταπε[ινου]μένους μὲν ἐξῆρεν Ἀ[θηναίους, μεγαλ̣]αυχουμέν[ους δὲ] σ[υ̣ν̣έ̣]σ̣τ̣[ε̣ιλ̣]ε..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13 II; Knögel, p. 52), and twice in the comment, "...καὶ διότι περὶ τοὺς πολυμαθεῖς ὀσμαὶ μόνον εἰσὶ πολλῶν, οὐ κατοχαί, καὶ τἀποτεύγματα περίεστιν τῶν παιδευμάτων, οὐ τὰ κατορθώματα...," (Wehrli, VI, p. 38, fr. 14 V; Knögel, p. 52). Equally important figures are homoeoteleuton and homoeoptoton, which Knögel groups together under the heading "Homoioteleuta" (p. 53), a term which seems to be used by him to cover all cases in which a series of similar endings appear. The following example (Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 VI) of homoeoteleuton is one of the few given by Knögel (p. 53) which seems to conform to the definitions of Quintilian and Demetrius quoted above:

> "εὑρήσει γὰρ ταπεινὸν ἕκαστον καὶ τὴν ἐπ' αὑτῷ
> καύχησιν ἀνάγωγον."[247]

Additional examples, not found on Knögel's list, are numerous and include the simple phrases "ἐπειδὴ [τὸ μ]ὲν ἐξαίρει, τὸ δὲ συστέλλ[ει],..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 34, fr. 13 III), as well as the fragmentary sentence "...[οὐ]δὲ δι' ὧν προσήκει, ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ π[ρὸς]ἡμᾶς ἀτιμάζει·" (Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 VI), and, finally, the phrase "...εἴτ' ἀπὸ τοῦ παραδεδομένου θυμιάματος ἢ μύρου τῶν [θ]εῶν ~~βρένθυος~~,..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 38, fr. 14 VI). Homoeoptoton occurs less frequently than homoeoteleuton, but it is found in antithetical phrases (listed by Knögel, p. 52, only as antithesis) such as "...καὶ ἔστιν τοῦ μὲν μεγαλοψ[ύ]χου τὸ καταφρονεῖν τῶν τυχη[ρ]ῶν ὑπερέχοντα τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄγκῳ, τοῦ δ'ὑπερηφάνου τὸ διὰ κουφότητα ταύτης ἐκπνευματούμενον ὑπὸ κτήσεως ὑπερορᾶν ἑτέρους....." (Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 VI) and "...[τὸν μὲν σεμνὸ]ν ἐπαινο[ῦντες] ὡς ἀξίαν ἔχοντα μετά τινος αὐστηρίας, τὸν δὲ σεμνοκόπον καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν πάντως ψέγοντες ὡς ἐπιφάσκοντα τὸν εἰρημένον καὶ προσποιούμενον εἶναι τοιοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ διὰ τῶν λόγων...κτλ," (Wehrli, VI, p. 38, fr. 14 VI; not mentioned by Knögel). Other types of repetition are evident in Ariston's fondness for alliteration created with words which have the same beginning syllable or letter, such as, "...καὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ κατασείονται καὶ κατασμικρίζοντα..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 38, fr. 14 VI; Knögel, p. 53), in his use of etymologically related words in combinations such as "...καὶ τὸν συναλείψαντα μὴ ἀντισυναλείφειν·καὶ ξενισθεὶς μ[ὴ]ἀντιξενίσαι·" (Wehrli, VI, p. 36, fr. 14 II; Knögel, p. 52), and in his employment of anaphora, as in "...ἅμα μὲν ὑπ' οἰήσεως, ἅμα δὲ διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερφρ[ο]νεῖν..." and "...διά τε τὴν ἄλλην ἀηδίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ τὰς πράξεις ἐξιδ[ι]άζε[σθ]αι θέλειν..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 V; Knögel, p. 51 mentions the διά anaphora).[247] The figure polysyndeton also appears quite frequently as, for example, in the phrases, "...ὡς [Ἡρ]ακλείτου καὶ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Ἐ[μ]πεδοκλέους καὶ Σωκ[ρ]άτους καὶ ποιητῶν ἐνίω[ν]..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13 I), and "...τά τ'ἐκ τῆς οἰήσεως καὶ τῆς ὑπε[ρ]ηφανίαςκαὶ ὑπεροψίας..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 37, fr. 14 IV; Knögel, p. 53).[248] In contrast to Bion's practice,[249] polysyndeton is used much more often than asyndeton (Knögel, p. 53) which, however, is found in

XUM

such phrases as "...ἀποδημεῖν ἀγοράζειν πωλεῖν ἀρχὴν μετιέναι τἆλλα συντελεῖν·" (Wehrli, VI, p. 36, fr. 14 II; Knögel, p. 53), and "...καὶ ῥήματα ἀ[μ̣]φίβολα τιθέναι,' χρ[η στόν]', ἡδύν' 'ἀφελῆ' 'γενναῖον' 'ἀν[δρεῖ]ον'·" (Wehrli, VI, p. 39, fr. 14 VII; Knögel, p. 53). Another figure occurring in the diatribe and in Ariston is isocolon, and, as examples, one may cite the phrases, "...ἐπειδὴ [τὸ μ]ὲν ἐξαίρει, τὸ δὲ συστέλλ[ει]..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 34, fr. 13 III; Knögel, p. 55), and "...τὰ μὲν μαθὼ[ν̣]παρὰ τῶν μάλιστ' ἐπ[ι]σταμένων, τὰ δ'ἰδὼν ποιοῦντας μόνον, τὰ δ'αὐτὸς ἐπινοήσας ἀφ' [α]ὑτοῦ...." (Wehrli, VI, p. 37, fr. 14 III; Knögel, p. 55).[250] Finally, Ariston's style includes a tendency which cannot be classed as a figure even though it resenbles both anaphora and polysyndeton. In his character sketches (Wehrli, VI, pp. 36-40, fr. 14 I - 14 IX) Ariston frequently begins or connects his sentences and long clauses with the conjunction καί. For example, in Ariston's description of the eiron, one finds a series of καί's in the section, "καὶ 'τίς γὰρ [ἡ]μῶν λ[ό]γος;' καὶ'εἰ δή τις ἡμ[ῷ̣]ν̣ ἔστα[ι μ]νεία'· καὶ πολὺς̣ [εἶ]ναι τ[ῷ̣]· 'μακάριοι τ̣[ῆ]ς φύ̣σεως εἰ δ[ή]τινες' 'ἢ 'τῆς δυνάμεως' ἢ' τ[ῆς] τύχης'. καὶ μὴ ψιλῶς ὀνομάζειν, ἀλλὰ 'Φαῖδρος ὁ καλός,' καὶ 'Λυσίας ὁ σοφός,' καὶ ῥήματ' ἀ[μ̣]φίβολα τιθέναι... καὶ παρεπιδείκνοσθ[αι]...." (Wehrli, VI, p. 39, fr. 14 VII). The importance of the repeated use of this conjunction will be indicated presently.

In addition to the traits and figures mentioned some minor themes commonly found in the diatribe are included in the fragments of Ariston. For example, the theme of old age and the proper attitude toward it, frequently used by Bion and Teles, makes its appearance in a comment made by the εἴρων, who says " 'νέος ὤφελον εἶναι καὶ μὴ γέ[ρω]ν, ἵν' ἐμαυτὸν ὑπέταξά σοι.' " (Wehrli, VI, p. 40, fr. 14 VIII), a remark which reminds one of the person, described in the fragment of Crates which is preserved by Teles, and presumably was used by Teles in a diatribe of his own, who is not satisfied with being old but instead longs for his lost youth (Teles, p. 50).[251] Further, tyche, who plays an important role in Ariston's discussion of "...[τῶν]διὰ τύχην ὑπ[ε]ρηφ[ά]ν̣ων[μόν]ων..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 33, fr. 13 I), figures prominently in Bion's warnings concerning the instability of fortune (Teles, p. 5.1 ff.; 52.1 ff.).[252] The frequent use of comparisons drawn from medicine (Wehrli, VI, p. 34, fr. 13 III; p. 35, fr. 13 VI; p. 36, fr. 13 VIII; Knögel, p. 51) provides another possible link with the diatribe which, according to Oltramare's view sometimes compared evil with sickness or the wise man with a doctor.[253] All of these themes concerning old age, fortune, and healing, however, are commonplace enough that one cannot assume that their presence necessarily indicates the influence of the diatribe.

The stylistic traits, the figures, and, to a considerably lesser extent, the themes which have been mentioned all seem to indicate the influence of the diatribe on Ariston, for, even though each of them belongs to the rhetorical tradition and is found in other types of literature, their use in combination reflects the diatribal style. One, however, cannot place any great importance on the diatribal elements found in the fragments of the character sketches, since the style of this work reflects very closely the style of the Characteres of Theophrastus, a fact which Knögel seems to have overlooked, despite his study of the Peripatetic themes found in the fragments of Ariston preserved by Philodemus. In Theophrastus' work, for example, one finds all of the important rhetorical figures used by Ariston in his character sketches. Polysyndeton is especially abundant and can be seen in a sentence such as, "ἀμέλει δὲ καὶ πίθηκον θρέψαι δεινὸς καὶ τίτυρον κτήσασθαι καὶ Σικελικὰς περιστερὰς καὶ δορκαδείους ἀστραγάλους καὶ Θουριακὰς τῶν στρογγύλων ληκύθους καὶ βακτηρίας τῶν σκολιῶν ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος ...." (areskeia, V, 9.25 ff.)[254] Further, Theophrastus shows the same fondness for the conjunction καί as does Ariston, and often begins or joins his sentences and long clauses with the connective. For instance, in the sketch of the aischrokerdes (XXX, 3.4 ff.) appears the following example of this repetition of καί:

> καὶ δανείσασθαι παρὰ ξένου παρ᾽ αὑτῷ καταλύοντος. καὶ διανέμων μερίδας φῆσαι δίκαιον εἶναι διμοιρίαν τῷ διανέμοντι δίδοσθαι καὶ εὐθὺς αὑτῷ νεῖμαι. καὶ οἰνοπωλῶν κεκραμένον τὸν οἶνον τῷ φίλῳ ἀποδόσθαι. καὶ ἐπὶ θέαν τηνικάδε πορεύεσθαι ἄγων τοὺς υἱεῖς, ἡνίκα προῖκ᾽ ἀφιᾶσιν οἱ θεατρῶναι. καὶ...κτλ.

One also finds asyndeton, as in the phrase, "...χρηννύναι τοῖς φιλοσόφοις τοῖς σοφισταῖς, τοῖς ὁπλομάχοις, τοῖς ἀρμονικοῖς ἐπιδείκνυσθαι·" (areskeia V, 10.31 ff.), and frequently isocola, such as "καὶ μὴν...πρὸς τὸ οὖς προσπίπτων διαψιθυρίζειν· καὶ εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἀποβλέπων τοῖς ἄλλοις λαλεῖν·" (kolnkeia, II, 10.31).[255] Alliteration, anaphora, homoeoteleuton and homoeoptoton are four other figures which are important in the style of Theophrastus and of Ariston, and which help support the impression that Ariston attempted to imitate Theophrastus. For example, alliteration, the most prevalent of all of these figures, is obvious in such phrases as "...καὶ κεκλημένος δὲ ἐπὶ δεῖπνον κελεῦσαι καλέσαι τὰ παιδία τὸν ἑστιῶντα..." (areskia, V, 5.11 ff.), and "'πράγματά μοι μὴ πάρεχε'· καὶ προσαγορευθεὶς μὴ ἀντιπροσειπεῖν..." (authadeia, XV, 3.3-4).[256] Anaphora appears in the repetition of οὔτε in phrases such as "...οὔτε τῷ ἀπώσαντι

XUM

αὐτὸν ἀκουσίως [οὔτε τῷ ὤσαντι]οὔτε τῷ ἐμβάντι..." (*authadeia*, XV, 6.8 ff.), and "καὶ οὔτε ᾆσαι οὔτε ῥῆσιν εἰπεῖν οὔτε ὀρχήσασθαι ἂν ἠθέλησει..." (*authadeia*, XV, 10.14 ff.) and with ἤ in the phrase "...ἢ κόφινον ἢ δρέπανον ἢ θύλακον,..." (*agroikia*, IV, 11.22). Examples of homoeoteleuton are not lacking and can be observed in simple form in "καὶ μηδὲν ὧν πράττει ὁμολογῆσαι, ἀλλὰ φῆσαι βουλεύεσθαι·" (*eironeia*, I, 4.10 ff.) and "καὶ ἀνάγεσθαι δὴ μέλλοντας κωλύειν. καὶ προσελθὼν δεῖσθαι ἐπισχεῖν,..." (*aedia*, XX, 3.3 ff.), as well as in the tricola "καὶ ἀκούσας τι μὴ προσποιεῖσθαι, καὶ ἰδὼν φῆσαι μὴ ἑορακέναι, καὶ ὁμολογήσας μὴ μεμνῆσθαι·" (*eironeia*, I, 5.14 ff.) in which homeoptoton also appears.[257] Finally, as evidence of other instances of homoeoptoton in Theophrastus, one may cite the corresponding participles in "καὶ τὸν κύνα προσκαλεσάμενος καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τοῦ ῥύγχους εἰπεῖν·" (agroikia, IV, 9.18-19), and the genitives in the sentence "καὶ ὡς βοηδρομιῶνος μέν ἐστι τὰ μυστήρια, Πυανοψιῶνος δὲ Ἀπατούρια, Ποσειδεῶνος δὲ<τὰ>κατ' ἀγροὺς Διονύσια·" (adoleschia, III, 5.17-19), in which homoeoteleuton and isocolon also are used.

Similarities between the work of Ariston and of Theophrastus, however, are not limited to rhetorical figures. Both writers, for example, seem to have begun each sketch with a brief definition of the character to be described. Theophrastus begins with a definition of the character trait which he intends to sketch, and then commences his remarks concerning the man who has this trait with the formula "ὁ δὲ...τοιοῦτός τις, οἷος..." or "ὁ δὲ...τοιόσδε τις, οἷος...." For instance, the sketch of the *authades* (XV, 1.1 ff.) begins with "ἡ δὲ αὐθάδειά ἐστιν ἀπήνεια ὁμιλίας ἐν λόγοις, ὁ δὲ αὐθάδης τοιοῦτός τις, οἷος ἐρωτηθείς, 'ὁ δεῖνα ποῦ ἐστιν;'...." Ariston, in so far as one can judge from the fragments preserved by

XUM

Philodemus, does not seem to have defined the trait but rather to have begun his sketches with a definition of the type of person possessing a given trait and, on at least one occasion, to have used the same formula used by Theophrastus. The following lines concerning the authades (Wehrli, VI, p. 36, fr. 14 I) are illustrative of Ariston's method:

> "ὃ δ᾽αὐθάδης λεγόμενος ἔοικε μὲν εἶναι μεικτὸς ἐξ οἰήσεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας καὶ ὑπεροψίας, μετέχων δὲ καὶ πολλῆς εἰκαιότητος. τοιοῦτο[ς] γάρ ἐστιν, φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων, ο[ἷ]ος ἐν τῇ μάκρα̣ θερμ[ὸ]ν [ἢ ψυ]χρὸν αἰτεῖν μ[ὴ π]ροανακρ̣[ίν]α̣ς τὸν συμβεβηκότ᾽, εἰ κακεί[νῳ συναρέσκει, καὶ...".[258]

While the methods of Theophrastus and Ariston are not identical, they are similar enough to indicate that Ariston was following the generic pattern established by Theophrastus.

Following such beginning remarks each author then continues his character sketches with vivid and straightforward descriptions of the activities and reactions of each character type. Theophrastus, for instance, illustrates his conception of the term "αὐθάδεια" by concisely describing the actions of the authades in answering a question, selling something, and receiving a gift, as well as in other situations. Similarly, Ariston (Wehrli, VI, pp. 36-37, fr. 14 I - 14 III) describes the authades by recounting some of his activities, such as his indifference concerning the name of a newly-purchased slave, his refusal to reply when some one answers his knock with "who is it?," and his unwillingness to include a greeting or a farewell in his letters (Wehrli, VI, p. 36, fr. 14 II, 20-26). Both authors, further, are fond of using direct speech to allow a character to reveal his nature through his own words. In his remarks concerning the *kolax*, for example, Theophrastus includes direct speech in which the flatterer delivers various compliments to the person whom he is trying to impress (cf. II, 2.4 ff. and II, 3.12 ff.), while in his description of the *anaisthetos* the same author aptly mixes the silly remarks made by this character type (cf. XIV, 7.10 and 13.19 ff.) with the narrative of his activities. Ariston also makes use of direct speech, primarily in his description of the *eiron*, where he combines remarks made by the *eiron*, such as "ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τί πλ[ήν γε]τούτου ὅτι [οὐ]δεν οἶδα..." (Wehrli, VI, p. 39, fr. 14 VII, 13-14), with the narrative depicting the insincerety of the dissembler.

A more detailed comparison of the styles of Ariston and Theophrastus could be made, but is unnecessary here, since the above discussion has shown sufficient similarities to indicate that Ariston must have been following the style and generic features established by Theophrastus for character sketches. Further, any stylistic similarities between the character sketches of Ariston and the diatribes of Bion must be traced back to the influence of their common rhetorical training or of Theophrastus, with whom Bion is said to have studied (Diogenes Laertius, IV, 52). One also must note here that the content of the sketches of Ariston does not reflect that of Theophrastus' *Characteres* and that Ariston's work includes character types, such as the *brenthuomenos* and the *panteidemon*, which do not appear in the sketches of his predecessor. Ariston, therefore, did not merely copy the work of Theophrastus, but only imitated his style, and seems to have relied on common Peripatetic concepts, stemming from Aristotle's own ethical works, for his delineation of various character types.[259]

XUM

In contrast to the character sketches the fragments of Ariston's Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας ἐριτομή, which comprise columns X, 30 - XVI, 33 (Wehrli, VI, pp. 33-36, fr. 13 I-VII) of Philodemus' *Peri kakion*, do seem to have been influenced by the diatribal style, especially since they include features found in the diatribe but not in the *Characteres* of Theophrastus. Chief among these features are the anecdotes mentioned above which occur only in the fragments drawn from the *epitome*. Further, the direct address to the listener found in column XV (Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 VI, 20 ff.; see above after footnote 243) and the possible use of infinitives as imperatives (see above at footnote 244) establish the exhortatory and didactic nature of Ariston's work. The combination of these stylistic traits with the rhetorical figures listed above, with the emphasis on the instability of fortune, and with the faint traces of *spoudaiogeloion* make Knögel's (pp. 50-60) assumption of diatribal influence on the author a reasonable theory, if confined to the fragments of the *epitome*. One, however, cannot state that the *epitome* itself was actually a diatribe in the Bionean tradition, for the evidence is too scanty to allow one to judge the nature of the complete work. Further, the title given by Philodemus, if it is correct, puts this work into the same general class as the *epitome* of Epicurean doctrine contained in Epicurus' letter to Heraclitus (see footnote 235 above), which is a didactic work but definitely not a diatribe. Perhaps, then, Ariston's *epitome* should be described as a brief treatise concerning the relief of a person from pride, or, as Albin Lesky describes it in his *A History of Greek Literature* (London, 1966; p. 687), "...a work about dietetics for the soul."

Although Philodemus made use of this *epitome* of Ariston which contained so many elements of the diatribe style, his treatise *Peri kakion* cannot be called a diatribe. The whole work, first of all, obviously would have been a treatise perhaps concerning different vices and virtues[260] and much too long and diversified to qualify as a single diatribe. Further, since the greater part of book X deals with the delineation of various character types, at least book X and possibly other books must be considered as belonging primarily to the tradition of the character sketches of Theophrastus and only incidentally to the diatribal tradition. Any rhetorical devices found in the few columns of the treatise not dependent on Ariston, finally, are common ones such as isocolon ("κἂν ἐπι|λαβήτα̣[ί]τι[ν̣]ο̣ς ἐξουίας | ὑποπτεύεται̣ γεν[ή]σε|σθαι π[α̣γ]κάκι̣σ̣τος,....;" col. V, 8-11),[261] alliteration ("[τ]εθαυμα|κὼς δέ τις οὕτω τὰ τοιαῦτα [μ]ήκιστον ἀπέχει τοῦ|καταφρονῆσαί ποτε αὐ|τῶν ....;" col. V, 26-30), anaphora ("...διότι προ σ|ή̣κ̣ει το[ις φ[ρονοῦσιν καὶ δ[ι|ό]τι κατα[...;" col. VI, 22-24) homoeoteleuton ("...οὐχ̣ ὁ ταῦτ᾽ἔχων, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ φαι|νόμενος καταφρονητ[ι|κὸς καὶ πάντων....;" col. VI, 28-30), and polysyndeton ("...κα]ὶ τὴν σε|μνότητα [κ]αὶ [τ]ῆς ὄψεω[ς| κα[ὶ] τοῦ π[αν]τὸ[ς] βίου·....;" col. VI, 19-21), which are found, as has been observed, not only in the diatribe but also in Theophrastus and in any work of a rhetorical nature.

D. Philodemus: Epicureans and the Diatribe

Several other works by Philodemus, however, unlike the *Peri kakion*, do seem to belong to the diatribal tradition. In their *Philodemus: On Methods of Inference, A Study in Ancient Empiricism* (p. 7) Phillip and Estelle De Lacy have observed that "the most numerous of his [i.e.

XUM

Philodemus'] works are diatribes in the field of practical ethics, including such titles as On Wealth, On Household Management, On Anger, On Flattery, On Vices."[262] The last work on this list must be eliminated of course, for the reasons given above. Further, with the *Peri kakion* probably should be classed the work *On Death* (*De Morte*), fragments of the fourth book of which are preserved. This work seems to have been a treatise composed of several books, but only fragments of the fourth book remain, which contain sufficient diatribal elements to allow the whole book to be classed as a diatribe on death or as a *consolatio* written in the diatribal style. One cannot make a definite statement concerning the nature of the entire work, however, and consequently, cannot call the *De Morte* a diatribe, but only can take note of the diatribal elements in book IV.[263] In the *De Morte* IV[264] one finds for example, long series of rhetorical questions such as the following (col. XXXII, 21-XXXIII, 5):

> ...ὑπολήψε|ται] παρ[αλλα]γὴν ἐλα[χ]ίστην [ἕ]χειν,| οὐχ]ὅτι
> [με]γά[λ]ην, [ὑπ]ὲρ γῆ[ν ἢ]ὑπὸ|γ[ῆ]ν ἀναισθ[η]τε[ῖ]ν; ἢ τίς,
> ἂν δ[ὴ] μετὰ | ταῦτα διὰ τιν[ο]ς αἰτίας γυμ[ν]ωθῆ<ι>|τὰ
> λείψα[ν]ά τ[ιν]ος, ὃ πολλάκ[ι]ς [οἴ]δα|μ[ὲ]ν γεγ[ονός],
> ο[ἰκ]τρὸν ἡγήσεται τὸν| οὐκ ὄντ[α]; τ[ίς δ'ο]ὐκ ἄν
> πεισθε[ί]η [κ]α[ὶ|τοὺς πε[ριε]σταλμένους καὶ [το]ὺς [ε]ἰς?|
> τάφους [εἰ]ς ἅ πο[τ]ε νομίζει σ[τοιχ]εῖ|α πάντας
> ἀναλυθήσεσθαι;...κτλ;

Also apparent in this text are the figures homoeoteleuton, in the infinitive endings of the first question, homoeoptoton, in the parallelism of ἐλα[χ]ίστην and [με]γά[λ]ην, and the wordplay with "ὑπὲρ" and "ὑπὸ." The introduction of dialogue through the creation of an imaginary character or opponent, another important trait of the diatribal style,[265] seems to take place in column XXXVII (2-10) where one man about to die laments, "'εἰ τοῦτ' ἐ|πιδὼν γενόμενον, ἀπέθνη<ι>σκον, οὐκ ἂν|ἐπεστρεφόμην τῆς τελευτῆς'," while another complains, "'ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ζώντων αἴρομαι, καὶ|πολλάκις ἀγαθὰ τοσαῦτ' ἔχων καὶ δυ|νάμενος ἀπολαύειν, ὁ δεῖνα δὲ καὶ ὁ δεῖ|[ν]α περιέσται.'" The statements of these two men make them fitting subjects for the moralizing antithesis which follows (XXXVII, 10-12), in which the author comments, "καὶ γὰρ βλέπεται δι' ὧν| ὁ μὲν τεύξεται παραμυθίας ὁ δ'οὐδὲ| προσφωνήσεως ἀξιωθήσεται." Philodemus' *De Morte* further reveals its debt to the diatribe in the rather frequent use of quotations from Homer, used to emphasize or illustrate some point. In column XXXIII (10 ff.), for example, after comments about the unimportance of concern for a proper burial,[266] one finds the following rhetorical question which includes a quotation from the *Odyssey* (V, 306-308; identified by S. Mekler, on p. 42 of his edition):

> πῶς δ'οὐκ ἄσ|τόχως ὁ λέγων 'Οδυσσεύς· 'τρὶς μακαρες|Δαναοὶ
> καὶ τετράκις, οἳ τότ' ὄλοντο Τροί|η<ι ἐ>ν εὐρείη<ι>χάριν
> 'Ατρειδη<ι>σι φέροντες-|ὣς καὶ ἐγὼν ὄφελον θανέ[ε]ιν-νῦν
> δέ|με λευγαλέωι θανάτωι εἵμαρτο ἁλῶναι,'|δυσπότμους
> ἐνόμιζεν τοὺς ἐν ταῖς να[υ|μαχίαις περὶ τῆς πατρίδος
> ἀποθανόν|τας ὡς τοὺς ἐπ' 'Αρτεμισίωι κ[αὶ] Σαλαμι|νι
> καὶ τοὺς ὕστε[ρ]ον καὶ μεθ' ἡμᾶς ταὐ[τὰ| πεισομένους;

Philodemus also quotes Homer indirectly, as in the phrase "...κ[αὶ|διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς αἰκιζομένους τὰ λείψα|να κ[ω]φὴν γαῖαν ἀεικ[ί]ζειν μενεαίνε[ι]ν| λέγ[οντ]ες ....," which is based on the comment of Apollo, found in the *Iliad*, XXIV, 54,[267] "κωφὴν γὰρ δὴ γαῖαν ἀεικίζει μενεαίνων." The use of such quotations, of course, is a stylistic trait of Bion who, for instance,

XUM

in his discussion of burial, preserved by Teles (p. 30), quotes lines from Euripides.[268]

Another type of example used in the diatribe and also found in Philodemus is the reference to historical or mythological figures whose stories are well-known and need no description.[269] In column XXX, 2, for instance, one finds the simple reference to "...τοῖς ὡς Μίλων εὐσά[ρ]κοις...," while column XXXIV (1-5) includes a reference to Palamedes, Socrates, and Callisthenes as examples of men sentenced to die "...ὑπὸ δικαστηρίου...ἢ δυνάστου...." Themistocles, "...ὃν φησί Θουκιδίδης νόσωι τελευτῆσαι...," and Pericles are mentioned in another passage (XXIX, 5-9), together with Epicurus and Metrodorus as great men who died from disease rather than in battle and who should be remembered. Fragmentary references to Tithonos (XIX, 34: "...ἂν καὶ[τ]ὸν τ[ι]θωνοῦ δ[ια|γένητ[αι]χρόνον...") and to "...τούς τ[ε?] Δαναοῦ καὶ τἀδελφοῦ καὶ τοῦ κά[δμου]..." (XXIII, 13-14) also appear. Slightly related to such examples is the reference to Diogenes the Cynic, found in column XXXVII, 13-15, which says that "...[τ]ὸ παντ̣[αχό]θεν| ἴσην εἶναι τὴν[ὁδὸ]ν τὴν εἰς Ἅιδο[υ] κατ̣[ὰ Διογ|ένην."[270]

Another important diatribal trait, the use of a polemical tone, seems to be present in the series of rhetorical questions quoted above, which begin in column XXXII (21 ff.) and continue into column XXXIII with their attack on those who worry about the manner of their burial. The tone of bitter ridicule in these lines, further, has some relationship to the diatribal spoudaiogeloion, although that trait is perhaps better seen in a section such as column XXXVII (2-3), in which is presented the complaint of the man who is dying "...πρὶν ἢ δυνατὸν εἴη ταῦτ' ἀναμαχέσα|σθαι,...,"[271] or in the comment (XXX, 1-3), "[κ]αὶ παραπέμπουσιν ὅτι [πάν|τες ἅμα τοῖς ὡς Μίλων εὐσά[ρ]κοις ὀλίγου|μὲν χρόνου σκελετοὶ γίνονται,...."

As a final indication of the diatribal style of the De Morte IV several figures of speech should be noted. Anaphora, first of all, occurs several times, notably in the triple repetition of διότι in column XXV, 30-35, and in the repetition of οὐδέ in the following lines, in which homoeoteleuton also appears (XXγι, 11-14):

> εἶτ' οὐδὲ<δι>|αὐτὸ φε[υ]κτὸν οὐκ ἔστι[ν οὐ]δὲ τὸ
> κατα|στρέφειν ἐπ' ἀλλοδημ[ίας] οὐδὲ δι' αὐ|τὸ τίμ[ι]ον τὸ
> ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκ[είας],....

Further, in column XX (1-4) one finds what seems to be the figure antistrophe, or the repetition of the final word in successive phrases, in the parallel, "...ἀλ|λὰ τοῦτο μὲν τὸ μέρος ὀδυνῶν τά|χα καὶ συνγνωστόν ἐστιν·τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τῶι|τοὺς δυσ[μ]ενεῖς ἐπιχαρήσεσθαι μά|ταιον ἀσ[υγγ]νώστως ἐστίν·...." Prominent alliteration occurs once as the repetition of π in the fragmentary sentence (XXVIII, 36-39), "...τε παρακο[λ]ουθεῖ πα[ντά|πασ[ιν, ἐπεὶ] πολλοὶ π[ροβ]άτων τ[ρό|πον ἐν ταῖς παρατά[ξ]εσιν ἀπόλλυν|ται." In addition to these types of repetition, Philodemus often uses different forms of the same verb, as well as verbs and nouns formed on the same or similar roots, in close proximity, forming an etymological figure, as, for example, in the clause "...εἰ μακαρίως ἡγοῦ[ν]ται βε|βιωκέναι καὶ βιώσεσθαι τοὺ[ς] παμπο|νήρο[υ]ς μέν, ἀπολ υ ομένους δὲ διαβο|λῶν ἢ μηδόλως διαβαλλομ[έ]νους|παρὰ τοῖς τοιούτοις...," (XXXV, 15-19). Homoeoteleuton, another repetitive figure, is not lacking and appears in "...τι ποτὲ πάσχουσιν|ἐφ' ἡμιν]ἐ[κ]λεί[πο]υσιν, ..." (XXI, 2-3) and in "...ἐπὶ τὰς ἐν τῶι ζῆν[πα]ρακολουθούσας|[ἐ]πὶ ξένης [γῆ]ς δ[υ]σχρ[ησ]τίας...." (XXVI, 6-7). Further, one observes polysyndeton in several passages, such as "...Πολύ[α]ινος καὶ Μη|τρό[δωρος κα[ὶ]Λεοντε[ὺ]ς καὶ 'Επίκου|ρ[ος αὐ]τὸς..." (XXIII, 4-6) and "...καὶ μυρίοι τῶν καὶ

XUM

μεγαλο|π[ρ]επῶν καὶ πλ[ο]υσίων καὶ δ[υ]ναστῶν..." (XXXII, 16-17). The multiple use of ἤ also appears several times and is especially obvious in "...γονεῖς ἢ παῖδα[ς] ἢ γα[μ]ε|τὴν ἤ τινα ἄλλους..." (XXV, 3-4). One final figure which must be mentioned is antithesis, which Philodemus employs in several passages. For example, in Column XIX (7-9) one finds the following contrast drawn between ἀφαίρεσις and κώλοσις:

> ..., τῆς μὲν εὐδαιμ[ο|νίας ἀφαίρ[εσι]ς οὐ γίνεται τῆς
> γεγονυίας,|κώλυσι[ς] δὲ τῆς ἔτι μετουσίας αὐτῆς.

A more involved antithesis is the long discussion contrasting death by disease and death in battle (XXVIII-XXIX) which includes the passage, mentioned above in the section on examples of historical figures, concerning Themistocles, Pericles, Epicurus, and Metrodorus.

Some of the themes which are expressed through the use of the stylistic traits and figures of speech noted above seem closely related to the prose *consolatio*, which has been defined as "...a stock literary-philosophical genre, designed to fortify men against the contingencies of existence - particularly death and exile - by marshalling the available arguments which might serve to console and comfort....,"[272] and which, existing prior to Bion,[273] seems to be connected to earlier poetic laments and funeral orations.[274] From an early time a close relationship existed between the *consolatio* and the diatribe, for, as Traudel Stork has observed, in her *Nil Igitur Mors Est ad Nos, Der Schlussteil des dritten Lukrezbuches und sein Verhältnis zur Konsolationsliteratur* (Bonn, 1970; p. 11), Crantor, the Academic philosopher whose work περὶ πένθους, a *consolatio* written for one Hippocles whose children had died, was the model for subsequent *consolationes*, was under the influence of his teacher Polemon who "...hatte der Akademie eine

XUM

Wendung zur praktischen Ethik hin gegeben und damit zu einer Popularisierung mit missionarischen Tendenzen....," and, further, was a friend of Crates, a teacher, of course, of Bion of Borysthenes. Crantor and, therefore, the *consolatio* as a genre seem to have been influenced by the popular philosophy of the Cynics and of the diatribe (Stork, p. 11). The *consolatio* and the diatribe remained separate genres, however, although, according to Paul Vallette, in his "Lucrèce et la Diatribe" (p. 534),[275] the *consolatio* "...a en commun avec celle-ci la plupart de ses arguments, et parfois la manière de les présenter....". Further "...de même que d'un trait de cynisme, la présence d'un trait de consolation est une présomption de dépendance à l'egard de la diatribe." One should not be surprised, then, by the presence of consolatory topics in a work like the *de Morte* which bears such a stylistic resemblance to the diatribe.[276] Such topics seem to be exemplified by Philodemus' emphasis on the inevitability of death (Columns XXXVII - XXXVIII; cf. Stork, p. 201, note 316),[277] by his comment "μάταιον δ᾿ἐσ|τὶ καὶ τ[ὸ] λυπεῖσθαι τελευτῶγτας ἐπὶ τῶ[ι τ]έκνα μὴ καταλείπ̣ειν..." (XXII, 9-11) which possibly was followed by arguments explaining this point of view,[278] and, finally, by his discussion of the futility of being concerned about one's burial, a section which includes a reference to those dying in shipwrecks (XXXII, 21 ff. - XXXIII, especially 15-19).[279] The contrast between the glory of death in battle and death by illness, in which Epicurus and Metrodorus are mentioned (XXIX, 1-10) as examples, is another possibly standard theme,[280] which, however, is a proper topic for an Epicurean, who would be unlikely to seek glory in battle and therefore die there. Other themes such as the lack of sensation after death, caused, of course, by the dispersal of the atoms of the soul, (XXXIII, 3-5)[281] seem Epicurean in origin, while the comparison of the wise man with the fool who "...οὔτ᾽ ἀξιόλ[ογον] ἐπιλ[ή]ψετ᾽ ἀγαθόν, ἂν καὶ [τ]ὸν Τ[ι]θωνοῦ δ[ια]γένητ[αι] χρόνον,...," (XIX, 33-35; quoted by Stork, p. 97) is a theme which cannot be confined to any one school or to the *consolatio* or diatribe.

While all of the topics mentioned easily could have been derived from consolatory literature, which was written in the Epicurean school as well as in others,[282] at least one of the themes found in the *de Morte* has a counterpart in the work of Bion and Teles. The discussion of burial found in columns XXXIII,- 21-37 and XXXIII, 1 ff. reflects Bion's comments (Teles, p. 31, 1-3), "εἰ δὲ μὴ κρυφθείης, ἀλλὰ ἄταφος <ῥιφθείης>, τί τὸ δυσχερές; ἢ τί διαφέρει ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαυθῆναι ἢ ὑπὸ κυνὸς καταβρωθῆναι ἢ ἐπάνω τῆς γῆς ὄντα ὑπὸ κοράκων ἢ κατορυχθέντα ὑπὸ σκωλήκων;"[283] Further, the close connection between the diatribe and the *consolatio*, which makes it difficult to assign the themes found in Philodemus definitely to a *consolatio*, can be observed in the fragments of Teles' Περὶ ἀπαθείας in which appear the comments (Teles, p. 61.2-4), "οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν μυριοστὸν ἔτος, οὐδ᾽ ἐπὶ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς προπάππους σου. σὺ δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τούτῳ οὐκ ἄχθῃ, ὅτι δὲ εἰς ὕστερον οὐκ ἔσται, δυσχεραίνεις....," which, with the polemic tone removed, could find a place in a *consolatio*. In another section of the same diatribe occur the following lines (Teles, p. 59.6 ff.) which also could be included in a consolatory work:

> πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἀλόγιστον καὶ ἄλλως μάταιον τὸ τελευτήσαντος τοῦ φίλου καθῆσθαι κλαίοντα καὶ λυπούμενον καὶ ἑαυτὸν προσκαταφθείροντα; δέον, ἵνα καί τι μᾶλλον φιλόσοφος δόξῃ παρὰ τοῖς ἀποπλήκτοις, πρὸ τοῦ τελευτῆσαι τὸν φίλον ὀδυνᾶσθαι <καὶ> κλαίειν, ἐνθυμούμενον ὅτι αὐτῷ ὁ φίλος θνητὸς ἐγένετο καὶ ἄνθρωπος.

XUM

The polemic tone is evident in this passage also, and is established by the use of ἀλόγιστον and μάταιον. It is this same polemic tone which seems to prevent Philodemus' *De Morte* IV from being classed as a *consolatio* and which establishes the close relationship between this work and the genre of diatribe.

While the *De Morte* IV, because of its fragmentary nature, cannot be classed, with absolute certainty, as a diatribe, other works of Philodemus, as listed above, do seem to conform to the stylistic requirements of the genre. The best example of a diatribe by Philodemus seems to be the *De ira* (*Peri orges*) in which many diatribal elements appear. In this work Philodemus refers to (Col. I, 16-19) "...Βίων ἐν τῶι|Περὶ τῆς ὀργῆς καὶ Χρύ|σιππος ἐν τ[ῶ]ι Πε[ρ]ὶ παθῶν θ̣ε̣ρ̣α̣πευ[τι]κῶι...," both of which are possible sources for Philodemus or perhaps for the Epicurean Zeno, whose work he used,[284] and which, in the case of Bion at least, seem to link Philodemus to the diatribal tradition. A brief stylistic analysis will serve to indicate the strength of this link. One must realize, of course, that all of the diatribal elements in this work may be due to the sources used and cannot be assumed definitely to represent the style of Philodemus himself. The following analysis will be concerned only with placing the *De ira*, as a work, within the diatribal tradition and will not attempt to make a distinction between Philodemus and his sources.[285]

One of the most important traits of the diatribal style, first of all, is the use of rhetorical questions which generally help to involve the listener or reader and which also give a polemic tone to the work. The following lines provide the only example from the *De ira* of a series of rhetorical questions producing these effects (XXXIX, 16-33):

XUM

> ἢ πῶς ἔ|τι μετὰ παρρησίας ἐροῦ|μέν τ[ι] πρὸς τοὺς λόγους| τῶν ἀφ̣αιρούντων τοῦ...| σπουδαίου... πᾶσαν ὀργήν;|πῶς φυσικὸν τὸ πρὸς τὰ| τηλικαῦτα ἐμποδίζον | καὶ δια τοσούτων| αἴτιον κα|κῶν; εἰ δὲ ἀνέκφευκτον|καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φυσικὸν| λεγόμενον πῶς οὐχὶ μέ|γα κακὸν καὶ σοφοῖς ἐστιν| ὑπομενητόν, ἢ πῶς οὐχὶ|καὶ περὶ τοὺς χαρίεντας|ὀργαί τινες ὁρώμεναι, δι|ότι πα̣ντὸς ἐστέρηται|τοῦ προσαναρτηθέντος ὑπὸ τούτων;

In five other passages (XIII, II; XVIII, 32; XX, 27; XXVIII, 35; XXXIII, 16) the questions seem to follow an established formula, beginning with the phrase "τί γὰρ δεῖ λέγειν..." or, in the case of column XXXIII, 18, with the variation "τί δεῖ διατρίβειν...." Some of these, with the exception of XVIII, 32 and XXXIII, 16, are examples of the figure *praeteritio* which the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines, under the name *occultatio* (IV, XXVII. 37 and note *a*.), as "...cum dicimus nos praeterire aut non scire aut nolle dicere id quod nunc maxime dicimus...."[286] Thus, when Philodemus asks "τί|γὰρ δεῖ λέγειν·τὸ πολ|λοὺς εὐθέτους ὄντας εἰς|φιλίαν, μήπω δὲ παρει|λημμένους ἄ[σ]τροις σημαίνεσθαι τὴν δαιμόν[ω]ν|πρόσοδον καὶ θεωρίαν|τῶν τοιούτων;," he actually wishes to call attention to the type of actions which he pretends to ignore. The use of this figure is quite effective in drawing the reader's attention to some point and also, of course, in providing stylistic variety within a long exposition. One other purely rhetorical question which also should be noted here appears in Column XL (29-37) and seems to fulfill the functions just mentioned, for it occurs in the midst of an expository section and provides emphasis and variety after a series of relatively short declarative sentences.

XUM

These rhetorical questions by themselves, of course, are not proof that the de Ira is written in a diatribal style. Additional evidence, however, is found in the one remaining rhetorical question which occurs in the work, for, as the following lines show (XLI, 27-35), within this question appears the imaginary, anonymous opponent who is introduced to present an objection which the author easily answers:[287]

> καὶ φήσει τις|ἀλλ᾽ εἰ διὰ τὸ βλάπτεσθαι|καθ᾽ ἑκούσιον
> τρόπον ὀργί|ζεται, βλάπτεται δ᾽ ὑπό|τινων εἰς τὰ
> μέγιστα, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ ...μεγάλην ὀργὴν|ἀναδέξεται
> καὶ σφοδρὰν|ἐπιθυμίαν ἕξει τοῦ μετελ|θεῖν;

Philodemus then begins his answer with (XLI, 35 - XLII, 3), "πρὸς ὃν ἐροῦμεν, ὅτι| τῶι βλάπτοντι τὰς τοιαύτας| β]λά[β]ạς ἢ φανερῶι [γ᾽ ὄν]τι, διότι μ̣[εγ]ά[λω]ς βλ̣άψει, προσαλλοτρ[ι]οῦται μὲν ἄκρως καὶ μισεῖ·," and proceeds with additional arguments. The author's attacks are by no means limited to such an imaginary opponent. In column XXXI, 31 ff., one finds a reference to the views of "ἔνιοι γοῦν τῶν Περιπατητικῶν..." which are discussed and rejected in the following lines. This common type of polemic, of course, unlike the use of an imaginary opponent, cannot be taken as definitive evidence for the use of the diatribal style.

Another important trait of the diatribe is the use of poetic quotations as a means of adding authority to the speaker's opinions and as a popular effect. Such quotations frequently are used by Philodemus in the De ira. For example, in a rather fragmentary section in which legendary occurrences of divine anger are described (XVI, 4-18), the author observes (XVI, 11) that Apollo took vengeance on "...τοὺς ἐπευφημοῦν|τας 'αἰδεῖσθαι θ᾽ ἱερῆα'...." Here Philodemus is partly paraphrasing and partly quoting the Iliad (I, 22-23),[288] which states,

'ἔνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἐπευφήμησαν 'Ἀχαιοὶ
αἰδεῖσθαί θ' ἱερῆα καὶ ἀγλαὰ δέχθαι ἄποινα·'

referring to the attempt of the Greeks to persuade Agamemnon to give up the daughter of Chryses. By quoting a phrase which must have been familiar to his readers and which would have reminded them of the plague which Apollo sent against the Greeks, the author is able to give a telling example of the wrath of that god without the use of a long descriptive passage. Another reference to Homer occurs (XVI, 4-7) within this same section and seems to be a paraphrase which presents a concise picture of another famous story. The sentence of Philodemus, which is fragmentary, reads, "Ὕπνος ὤ[ι]γε Ζεὺς ἐχθ[ρὸς|ὢν] <ἐκ> τῆς τυχούσης αἰτίας]ῥεῖψαι κἄπειτα πᾶσ[ι...," and seems to reflect the following lines from the Iliad (XIV, 256-257):[288]

...ὁ δ' ἐπεγρόμενος χαλέπαινε
ῥιπτάζων κατὰ δῶμα θεούς....

Philodemus, further, makes use of the very familiar opening passage of the Iliad (I, 2) to illustrate succinctly the effects of one's anger on friends, relatives, and nation (XXIX, 17-25). References to other poets also appear in the form of mere allusions, such as the one to Sophocles' character Achilles (in column XVIII, 18) or the brief mention of the anger of Dionysos, which may allude to Euripides' Bacchae, 26 (XVI, 15-18; cf. Wilke, p. 38), or in the form of an apparent paraphrase, such as that of Menander in the passage (XXXVIII, 16-21), "...(κα|κῶς γὰρ ἀκούων καὶ πάσ|χων ὅστις οὐκ ὀργίζεται, Πονηρίας πλείστ[ης]τεκμήριον φέρει κα|τὰ τὸν Μένανδρον,...."

The opinions of various philosophers, especially, but not exclusively, Epicureans, frequently also are cited to provide apt illustrations or to add weight to an argument, just as Bion and Teles often cite Crates, Stilpo, or Diogenes in the middle of an argument.[289] For instance, in column XI, 17-21, appears a quotation from Plato's *Laws* (717c), while the Stoic Antipater, who, according to Athenaeus (XIV, 643 ff.; SVF, III, fr. 65; cited by Wilke, in his apparatus, p. 69), wrote a *Peri orges*, is cited in a later passage (XXXII 28 ff.). Democritus (fr. 143, Diels) also is quoted, in the passage concerning the effects of anger on others (where the *Iliad*, I, 2, also is quoted). Further, Epicurus is mentioned in four passages (fr. H, 10; XXXV, 3; XLV, 5; XLVIII, 37), but not directly quoted. One finds in column XXXIV, 30 - XXXV, 6, for instance, the statement, "φαί[νο]νται δ'[οὖ]ν πρὸς τό|σον καὶ τὴν [ἐν]αντιωτ̣ά|τη]ν ἔ̣χ̣ο̣ντες διάθεσιν,|ὥστε κἂν σοφός, καθάπερ|ἀμέ̣[λει]καὶ Ἐπίκουρος,|ἀπέ̣[δωκεν ἐ]νίοις τοιού|του̣ [φαντασ]ίαν·," in which Epicurus is named as an example. What could be called a paraphrase does occur in one passage (XLV, 5-8), where Philodemus comments that Epicurus, in his *Utterances* (*Anaphōnēses*), distinguished between "...[τό] τε θυμωθή|σεσθαι καὶ [τὸ] μετρίως,...." In addition to these references in which Epicurus himself is cited, one passage (XLIII, 18-21) mentions some who "...πάνδεινον ἡγήσαντο ταῖς| κυρίαις δόξαις ἀντιγρά|φοντες,...." Other Epicureans mentioned include Metrodorus (XII, 14 and XLV, 9; see also Wilke, p. XX) and Hermarchus (XLV, 13; cf. Wilke, p. XX).[290] Further, Philodemus cites two Peripatetic philosophers, Nausicrates (fr. F, 14; XXXVII, 5; XXXVIII, 28; see also Wilke's discussion, pp. xxi ff.) and Timasagoras (VII, 7; see Wilke, p. xxi ff.), whom he criticises and who, therefore, are not to be counted among the authorities cited by the author.

Closely related to the citation of poets or philosophers are the references to mythological or historical figures which serve to exemplify the author's contention. One of the two references to mythological characters which occur outside of a direct quotation is found in column XIV

(10 ff.) where, after a fragmentary references to those who are out of their senses and exasperated and who are angry at the wrath of "...τῶ̣ν̣ πα| ραδεδομένων θε̣ῶν..." (XIV, 3-4), the author mentions the many men who resemble the sons of Oedipus, Pelops, and Pleisthenes and "...τῶ[ν] τ' ἄλ|λων προσηκ̣[ό]ντων, κα|θάπερ μύρι̣[ο]ι καὶ πάλαι καὶ|νῦν." In the second reference (XVI, 10-18), also concerned with divine wrath, appears a description of Apollo's anger, which is illustrated by a Homeric quotation (*Iliad*, I, 23) and by mention of Apollo's sister Artemis and the children of Niobe, and which is followed by a reference to the vengeance taken by Dionysos against Cadmus "...ἕνε|κα τῆς τῶν θυγ̣[ατέ]ρων|αὐτοῦ βλασφη[μίας]." Philodemus' historical examples are limited to Alexander the Great, who is mentioned three times. The first of these references (XVIII, 22 ff.) appears as the only anecdote in the *de Ira* and concerns the actions of Alexander's hound who did not deign to attack any animal except a lion, in contrast to other hounds.[291] Following this anecdote occurs the caustic observation, "...οἱ δὲ τῶν ποι|ητῶν θεοὶ μικροῦ καὶ| ...τα[ῖ]ς ὑ̣σὶν ὀργίλως|δ̣ιατίθενται...," which seems to connect this anecdote, and the preceeding section of the column, with the references to heroic and divine anger mentioned above, and which also adds a polemic tone to the passage. The other two references to Alexander are found within the same column and are only slightly connected. In a section critical of those who criticise the opinion, attributed to Epicurus, that emotions such as anger or joy are weaknesses (cf. Wilke, p. XX ch. Epicurus, κΔ, I) appears the statement (XLIII, 24-28), apparently repeating an example commonly used by these critics, that the powerful Alexander was oppressed by wrath and also pleased by countless things. Philodemus

XUM

then notes (XLIII, 28-37) that weakness which is inconsistent with champions and kings "...λαμβάνεται κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' ἡ δεκτ[ι]κὴ| κατασκευὴ καὶ φύσις θανά|του καὶ ἀλγηδόνων, ἧς καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος δήπου καὶ πᾶς ὅλως ἄνθρωπος με|τέσχηκεν,...." Both of these passages seem commonplaces because of their use of Alexander, a stock example of power, but, as such, they effectively make their point through the use of an easily recognized and understood symbol. One should note here that Alexander apparently was already for Teles a standard example of the desire for immortality (at which Philodemus' references to death and Alexander seem to hint), since, in a section concerned with dissatisfaction with one's lot (Teles, p. 43, 4-6), Teles illustrates the insatiable wishes of the dissatisfied man with the following phrase in which Alexander appears:

> εἶτα δύο, εἶτα κἀγρόν, εἶτ' Ἀθηναῖος...γενέσθαι, εἶτα
> ἄρξαι, εἶτα βασιλεῦσαι, εἶτα, ὥσπερ Ἀλέξανδρος,
> ἀθάνατος γενέσθαι·...[292]

In addition to the other stylistic traits mentioned some traces of humor or spoudaiogeloion appear, often combined with a polemic tone and directing ridicule against an opponent. The lines quoted above (XVIII, 29-32) which concern the gods of the poets are one example of this type of ridicule. In column XVII (15-23) is found another instance of polemical derision which, in this case, amounts to a reductio ad absurdum. After a fragmentary description of the wild actions of an angry man,[293] itself an example of spoudaiogeloion used in a brief character sketch, Philodemus makes the following remark:

> περὶ|μὲ̣ν γὰρ τοῦ μι[κ]ρὸ̣[ν] το[ῦτ']| εἶναι τὸ πάθο[ς] ἔργον
> λέ|γειν, ὅταν καὶ [μ]υίαις φό|νο[υ]ς μηχανῶνται δε[ι|ν]οὺ[ς καὶ]

> κώνωψιν μετὰ| βριμώσεως καὶ ἀπειλῶ|σι καὶ ῥαπίζωσ̣ιν ὡς
> κα|ταφρονούμενοι.

One final example which should be cited is noteworthy more for its biting tone than for any humor. In column I (8 ff.) Philodemus mentions an unnamed opponent who tries to show that it is silly to censure anyone, and who does this (I. 10-12) "...ἀ|δολέσχως δὲ καὶ καθάπερ εἴωθεν." The author then (I, 20-27) includes the rather circular argument of his adversary who claims that (see also Wilke, p. XV) it is absurd to put attendant evils before someone's eyes and that "...καὶ ληρῶδες ὑπολαμ|βάνων αὐ[τός ἐστι ληρώ|δης καὶ κα[ταγέλαστος."

Several descriptive passages also have a tone of spoudaiogeloion. For example, in a section (VIII, 15 ff.) which describes the physical manifestations of anger (cf. Wilke, p. XVI), Philodemus mentions the evidence provided by the voices of those "...τοτὲ|μὲν ε̣ὐχομένων περιζώ|σασθαι τοῖς ἐντέροις τοῦ λυ|πήσαντος, τοτὲ δ' ὠ̣μὰ δάσασθαι',...," quoting Homer (XXIII, 21) in the phase "...ὠμὰ δάσασθαι,...." The absurdity of the comments and the representation of the blustering angry man are obviously humorous. In addition, the introduction of a quotation from Homer into a passage concerning the description of a typical angry man adds humor through incongruity, and, rather than elevating the angry man to epic status, seems indirectly to ridicule the anger of the typical epic hero. One should connect this passage with the description of anger found in fragment I, which details the flashing eyes, the ruddy face, and the neck with swollen veins of a very angry man, a picture not without humor.

Actions done in rage provide another source of ridicule. In column XIII, 11-17, for instance, one finds the following rhetorical question which derides the wild (and potentially dangerous) reactions caused by anger:

> τ[ί γ]ὰρ| δεῖ λέγειν τὸ μηδ' ἀπ[ω]σ̣|μένους ἀλλ' ἐπιφερομέ|νους
> ἐνίοτε διὰ τὴν ἀνε|πιστασίαν εἰς ξύλα καὶ|τοίχους
> καὶ τάφρους ἤ τι | τοιοῦτον ἐνπίπ̣τειν;[294]

The absurd conduct of the man who, when he is counting money on a ship and finds that one tetradrachmon is missing, becomes angry and pours out all of the money into the sea, provides a second vivid illustration of the stupidity of rage (XV, 25-30). One final example of spoudaiogeloion in the *De ira* can be observed in the description, derived from Bion,[295] of the actions of other people towards the irascible man (XXI, 23-35). As the author notes, "το|σοῦτο γὰρ ἕκαστος ἀπο|λείπει τοῦ προσπελά|ζειν τοῖς τοιούτοις ὁμει|λήσων, ὡς καὶ φεύγει πε|ριληφθεὶς ἀπὸ τύχης ἐν | κο̣[υ]ρείοις ἢ μυροπωλί|οις [ἢ] συμποσίοις ἢ παρα|καθίσας ἐν θεάτροις ὡς| κύ[να] τετοκυῖα <ν>·...." Further, no one dares to embark on the same ship as such a person does or to be his neighbor. Especially apt, of course, is the comparison drawn between the fleeing "victim" and the dog who has given birth, which presents an image at once familiar and easily understood, and therefore suitable for the diatribal style. Descriptive passages such as these concerning actions done in anger are, of course, brief character sketches designed to illustrate the author's statements on the effects of rage and which, unlike the sketches of Theophrastus or those of Ariston found in Philodemus' *Peri kakion* X, are only one of the devices used by the author within a larger treatise, perhaps as a result of the influence of Bion.[296]

The use of comparisons or images drawn from familiar experiences or aspects of daily life (see above at footnote 100) is a diatribal trait closely related to the employment of such character sketches as have just been

XUM

mentioned, since in all of these is involved the attempt to explain something to the reader or listener in a simple and also memorable fashion. The simile involving a dog has already been discussed above, and one should add to it the anecdote concerning the actions of Alexander's hound, who would hunt only lions, and those of other hounds, who easily were distracted (XVIII, 22 ff.), an anecdote which, while not a formal simile, serves a comparable purpose. In addition to these two comparisons involving animals in familiar situations, there appears (XXVII, 15-28) the following simile in which the rage of lions is compared to that of the man of savage and harsh disposition:[297]

> ...βιάζεται μη|δὲ τῶν φιλτάτων ἀπέχεσ|θαι μετ᾽ ἐπιθυμίας παν|τὸς ὠνουμένης ἃ ποθεῖ|καὶ βριμώσεως θηριώδους|οὐδὲ παυομένης ὡς τῆς τῶν λεόντων, ὅταν ἐκτὸς|ὁ βλάπτων γένηται τῆς|ὄψεως ἢ παύσωνται τῆς|ἐνδείας, ἀλλ᾽ ἕως καὶ νε|κρῶν προπηλακ[ι]σμοῦ βα|διζούσης καὶ τὸ π̣έρας ὥσ|περ εἰς αὐτὴν τι̣μωρίαν μετ]ατ[ρ]επούσης.

Philodemus also often makes use of comparisons drawn from the field of medicine, obviously attempting to stress the palliative nature of philosophy. For example, the discussion in column IV concerning the need for the patient to realize the extent and possible results of his illness, so that "...ἐ]πιστρ[εφ]εῖς πρὸς τὴν|θ]εραπεία̣ν παρασκευάζει...." (IV, 17-19),[298] is an illustration closely linked to the following column (V) which continues the medical imagery and then begins a discussion of the evil effects which follow anger (17 ff.). The description of a man who cannot endure constructive criticism without becoming angry includes another example of a medical simile, for the author compares the nature of this type of person with the savage nature of wounds which cannot endure the touch of even the most gentle medicines (XIX, 17-21). Further, Philodemus' lengthy ennumeration of the physical manifestations of rage (VIII-IX) makes use of comparisons taken from medicine and athletics to clarify the picture which the author is attempting to present. The throbbing of the head, trembling limbs, and paralysis of anger are likened to the symptoms of an epileptic (IX, 1-4),[299] while the irregular breathing of the enraged person is described as (VIII, 25-27) "...τὸ μετεωρότερον ἆσθμα| τῶν [χίλ]ια δεδρα|μηκότων στάδια...." In concluding this section Philodemus notes that one can learn from doctors and from one's own observations that effects such as those described can lead to death (IX, 10-20), a comment which serves to emphasize the importance of the preceeding illustration. There follows then a section concerning the spiritual effects of anger which causes melancholy and eventually even physical illness (X).

The use of similes or analogies referring to illnesses and their treatment is not unknown in diatribal literature. Diogenes Laertius notes that Antisthenes (see above at footnotes 19 and 20) when asked why "...πικρῶς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐπιπλήττει,' καὶ οἱ ἰατροί,' φησί,' τοῖς κάμνουσιν.'..." (VI, 4), and that at another time (VI, 6), when he was reproached because he associated with worthless fellows Antisthenes replied that doctors are in the midst of the sick, but do not fall ill with a fever.[300] Further, in the fragments of Teles' Περὶ φυγῆς appears a section of dialogue (which Hense, p. 25, compares to Xenophon, *Apol*. *Socr*. 28) in which one of the speakers, discussing the disgrace involved when inferior men are elected leaders, comments that such an occurrence (Teles, p. 26, 5-8) is analogous to people dismissing the best physician in favor of a dealer in drugs and entrusting the public work to him. One fragment of Bion's work also contains a medical analogy. Following the warning that one who wishes to free himself or another from want should not seek "χρήματα" for him, Bion observes that to do so would be an act similar to that of the man who, eager to relieve the dropsical man of his thirst, does not treat the dropsy, but, instead " "...κρήνας δὲ καὶ ποταμοὺς αὐτῷ παρασκευάζοι...." (Teles, p. 39.1-4; cf. Fiske, p. 184), an exaggeration, perhaps, but also an effective analogy. Comparisons drawn from the medical field, of course, are by no means limited to the diatribe, and one, therefore, cannot assume that Philodemus made use of medical terminology and analogies only because he found them in diatribes. In fact, he may have been following Chrysippus[301] (see Wilke, p. XXXVI-XXXVII and SVF, III, fr. 457) or perhaps even a tradition within the Epicurean school, for Epicurus himself used medical metaphors in sayings such as (*Sent*. *Vat.*, LIV), "οὐ προσποιεῖσθαι δεῖ φιλοσοφεῖν, ἀλλ' ὄντως φιλοσοφεῖν· οὐ γὰρ προσδεόμεθα τοῦ δοκεῖν ὑγιαίνειν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὑγιαίνειν.," and (*Vita*, 138), "διὰ δὲ τὴν ἡδονὴν καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς αἱρεῖσθαι, οὐ δι' αὑτάς, ὥσπερ τὴν ἰατρικὴν διὰ τὴν ὑγίειαν." One, thus, can assume only that some of the medical analogies may be due to diatribal influence, but that they also may be the result of other influences.

To all of the other devices mentioned thus far one should add the tendency for the writer of diatribes to include remarks or sayings that are succinct, pointed, and easily remembered, whether they take the form of a witty remark, such as those recorded by Diogenes Laertius (IV, 46 ff.) as examples of Bion's wit, or of maxims (on which see Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica*, II, 1394A 17 ff.). Within the *de Ira* appear several remarks which fit into the category of maxims, and which, when added to all the other diatribal traits which appear, may be taken as further examples of the use of a popularized or diatribal style. One finds in column XI (21-23), for instance, the warning (following a quotation from Plato, *Leg*. 717C) "οὐ γὰρ|ἔστιν ἀναλαβεῖν τὴν | πρ[ο]ẹ[ι]μ̣ένην ἅπαξ φω|[ν]ήν...."[302] In the section concerned with the evil actions of those whose anger drives them even to sacrilege (XIV) appears another memorable saying, for Philodemus observes that (XIV, 16-22), "ἀμέλει γὰρ καὶ φιλο|τιμότερόν ἐστι καὶ τῆς|ἐρωτ̣ικῆς[ἐ]πιθυμίας| τὸ κακόν,| καὶ καταρχόμε|νον ἀπ'ἐλαχίστου μέχρι καὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἐξοκέλ|λειν ποιεῖ." A third example (XVI, 26-32), also worthy of citation, compares anger to madness by commenting that, "μανίας τ[ο]ιγα̣[ρο]ῦν|οὐχ ὁμο[γ]εν[ῆ]εῖ|ναι συμβέβηκε [τὴν]ὀρ|γήν, <ὀλιγοχρόνιον μανίαν> δέ τις εἴρ[ηκεν, ἀ]λ|λ' ἐνίοτ[ε] τὴν [ὄντως κα|λουμένην μ[ανίαν ὀρ|γὴν προσ[αγορεύομεν."[303]

Maxims, analogies, spoudaiogeloion, and all of the other stylistic traits of the *De ira* which have been discussed are presented through the use of the rhetorical figures commonly found in the diatribe and in other strongly rhetorical writings. One of the most obvious figures is polysyndeton which frequently appears. For example, column XXVIII includes the following (and perhaps extreme) example (28-35):

> ἐπακολουθεῖ δὲ τοῖς ἔχου|σιν αὐτὸ καὶ τὸ δεσποτικοῖς|
> γίνεσθαι καὶ καχυπόνοις καὶ|ψεύσταις καὶ ἀνελευθέροις|καὶ
> δολίοις καὶ ὑπούλοις καὶ|ἀχαρίστοις καὶ φιλαύτοις....

Other instances worthy of mention are the phrase (VIII, 8-13), "...ἐ̣ξ| ἐκπυρώσεως καὶ διοιδή|σ]εως καὶ διερεθισμοῦ| καὶ βριμώσεως καὶ δεινῆς| ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ μετελ|θεῖν καὶ ἀγωνίας,...," in which the polysyndeton serves to emphasize the variety of elements involved in rage, and "...καὶ λοιδορεῖν ἀπλύτως| καὶ διαβάλλειν καὶ πλάτ|τειν τὰ μὴ γε[γ]ονότα καὶ|τὰ μηδενὸς ἄξια λόγου|μεγαλύνειν...," where the figure serves a similar purpose.[304] Alliteration occasionally is evident, although it seems to serve no purpose beyond possible emphasis. In fragment 4, for example, occurs (17-19), "[καὶ ἕτερος] δὲ ἅτε|πλούσιος ὢν]καὶ πολ|λάκι [πορίζ]εται...," while column IX (12-15) includes a similar example in the words "...πλευμό[ν]ων καὶ|πλευρῶν πόν[ο]υ̣ς καὶ πολ|λὰ τοιουτότρο[π]α πάθη...."[305]

The important figures homoeoteleuton and homoeoptoton frequently are used, again probably for emphasis and for their sometimes pleasant effect. A prime example of homoeoteleuton is (XLII, 1-3), "διότι μ̣[εγ]ά[λω]ς β̣λ̣άψει,| προσαλλοτρ[ι]οῦται μὲν ἄ|κρως καὶ μισεῖ·....". As further instances one may cite "...πάλιν θυμοῦν|τα]ι καὶ συμπλεκόμε[νοι | ἐπι]παροινοῦνται....," (XIII, 9-11), and (XVI, 22-24) "...καὶ διαβολαῖ[ς τῶν]τυ|χόντων,...ἐνίοτ̣[ε δὲ] κ̣αὶ|τῶν ἐ[χ]θρῶν,...."[306] Homoeoptoton is well illustrated by the antithetical phrases (XXXI, 24-28), "...τῶν δὲ φιλοσό|φων οἱ μὲν φλυαροῦντες|ἐν ταῖς παραμυθίαις , οἱ δὲ καὶ μετὰ σ̣υνηγορίας ἐ|πιρρώννυντες·...," and by the sentence (XLVIII, 20-24), "ἀλλ' οὐ μόνον τοῖς σο|φὸν ποιήσασιν εὐχαρισ|τεῖ μεγάλως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἔνια τῶν ἄλλων παρασκευάσασιν." In addition to these figures, isocolon, which helps make remarks memorable, appears, sometimes alone, and sometimes with homoeoptoton, as in (XLVI, 22-25), "[εἰ|δ' οὐκ ὀργισθήσεται τού|τοις , οὐδ' ἐκείνοις εὐχαρι̣[σ|τήσει·...," and in the second example of homoeoptoton quoted above (XLVIII, 20-24).[307] These sentences featuring isocolon are also examples of the figure antithesis which is further exemplified by the following passage (XLIX, 29-35), and serves the same illustrative purpose as a comparison:

> καθάπ[ε]ρ γὰρ χωρὶς| τοῦ γράμματα μαθεῖν οὐχ οἷ|όν τ̣[ε]...
> γε|νέσθαι σοφόν, ἀλλ' οὐκ, εἰ γράμ|ματά τις ἔμαθεν, ἐποισθή|σ̣εται
> τὸ καὶ...σοφὸν αὐ̣|τ̣ὸν ὑπάρχειν, ο̣ὕτως οὐδὲ...κτλ.[308]

Anaphora, the figura etymologica, and paronomasia are additional figures used by Philodemus. For instance, in a fragment concerned with the physical manifestations of anger, the author emphasizes the different effects of rage on various people, when he employs anaphora in the phrases (fr. 1, 14-15),

XUM

"ἔ|νιοι δὲ [αἱ]μηρό[ν, ἔ]ν[ιοι δὲ|τὸν τράχηλον ἐντε[τα|μένον....". Similar examples are (VI, 16-17) "...τ[ι]νὰ μὲν καὶ τῶι γέ|νει, [τι]νὰ δὲ τ[ῶ]ι μεγέ|θε[ι...," and (XIII, 25-27), "...τοτὲ μὲν τοῖς | ὁ̣μο[ί]οις, το<τὲ> δὲ φυγαῖς ἐκ τῶν|πατ[ρίδ]ων...."[309] Another favorite device of Philodemus is the use in close proximity of two or more words which have the same root (see footnote 364 below). In one sentence of column XLVII (27-39) appear the forms βλαπτόμ[ενος], βλάπτεσθαι, βέβλαπται, and βλάβης, a collocation obviously intended to force the reader to grasp the notion of harm. A less extreme example is (XLV, 25-26) "...τοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἔννοιαν θυμοῦ|θυμωθ[ήσεσθα]ι ...." As another instance one may cite (XXIII, 4-5) "...μεθοδεύ[οντας μεθό|δ̣ευμα...." *Paronomasia* is emphatic (XXXIII, 23-24) in "...περὶ τῶν νεύρων τῶν ἀ|νεύρων...," and (XXXII, 25-26) "...τὴν εὔλογον...τινων|καὶ τὸν ἄλογον...."[310] The use of *paronomasia* and its close relative, the *figura etymologica* (see footnote 364 below), serves to entertain the reader and also to make memorable the thought which the figures convey. As the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* warns, however, (IV, xxiii, 32), "eiusmodi autem studia ad delectationem quam ad veritatem videntur adcommodatiora." Further, "...si crebro his generibus utemur, puerili videmur elocutione delectari; item, si raro interseremus has exornationes et in causa tota varie dispergemus, commode luminibus distinctis inlustrabimus orationem." With the possible exception of the first example given above (XLVII, 27-39), Philodemus seems to avoid the pitfalls and to use these figures effectively.

A few other figures and stylistic tendencies must be mentioned here to complete the description of Philodemus' work. An especially striking figure, first of all, is chiasmus,[311] which is found in the following phrase (XXXIII, 24-26):

> ...καὶ ταχέως[ἐ|γλυόντων [κ]αὶ κατ᾽ ἄκριτον|
> ἐξόντω[ν β]ιαίως,....

A less obvious example is (XLVI, 25-30) "τὸ γὰρ ἀντίστρο|φον γίνεται πάθος ἐπὶ θα|τέρου πρὸς θάτερον, καὶ|κινεῖ, καθάπερ τὴν εὐχα|ριστίαν, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ὀρ|γὴν τὸ ἑκούσιον·...," in which homoeoptoton and alliteration are especially obvious. The effect such a device would have on the average reader perhaps would be the production of momentary admiration for the cleverness of the author which, in turn, might make the point of the sentence in which the figure appears more easily remembered.

Another noteworthy element of the style of Philodemus is his occasional use of an excessively parallel structure in which there often occurs a repetition of endings which cannot be classed as either homoeoptoton or homoeoteleuton. The following sentence with its accumulation of adverbs is the best example of this tendency (XLVIII, 5-12), here connected with isocolon and homoeoteleuton:

> εἰ φυσικῶς ὁ̣ρ̣|μῶμεν ἐπὶ τὸ συντόνως|εὐχ̣[αρισ]τεῖν τ̣[ο]ῖς
> ἑκουσ[ί|ως εὐ̣[εργετήσα]σιν, ἐκκα|λού]μεθα φ[υσικ]ῶ̣ς κἀ[πὶ|τὸ]
> σ̣υ[ν]τόνω[ς ὀρ]γίζεσθαι|τ[ο]ῖς β[λ]άψ[ασ]ι κατὰ [π]ρο|αίρε]σι[ν].

As other examples, one may cite the phrases (XXXVII, 31-34) "...ἐν ταῖς σ[υ]μμε|τρήσεσι τῶν ἐλα[ττ]ω|μάτων καὶ ταῖς κολά̣σ̣ε̣|σι τῶν βλαπτόντων....," and the sentence (XLVI, 18-22) "εἰ τ[οῖ]ς καλῶς|παρ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς κ[εχ]ρημένο[ις| εὐχαριστήσει σοφὸς ἀνήρ,|καὶ τοῖς ἑκουσίως βλάψα|σιν αὐτὸν ὀργισθήσεται·...," which, incidentally, precedes the second example of chiasmus noted above (XLVI, 25-30). Parallelisms such as these can, of course, be overdone and thus give a passage a stiff and contrived appearance,[312] a fault which is not lacking in Philodemus, but which, at the same time, possibly serves a

XUM

didactic purpose, calling attention to the phrases involved and impressing them upon the reader's memory.

All of the figures, devices, and traits which have been mentioned are found, individually, in different types of literature. Once again it is their use in combination, together with a tone that is not only polemic, but also slightly satirical in its use of spoudaiogeloion, which places Philodemus' De ira within the diatribal tradition, although one probably should call the work a diatribal treatise rather than an actual diatribe, in view of the rather technical nature of the concluding columns (cf. H. A. Fischel, Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy, Leiden, 1973, who refers to Philodemus "...use of the diatribic-rhetorical tract..."). Further, the homiletic nature of the work cannot be ignored. The author depicts various aspects of wrath which are either ridiculous or harmful, thereby indirectly urging his reader to avoid such excesses, and then concludes his treatise with arguments concerning the reactions of the sage as defined by Epicurus and Metrodorus. The fact that the concluding sections are directed against those who criticized the opinions of Epicurus and Metrodorus (cf. Wilke, pp. XX-XXI and XXIV-XXVI) does nothing to diminish their ability to present a picture of the sage to counterbalance the earlier excoriations of the angry man who cannot control his actions.

Since Philodemus, therefore, has a place within the diatribal tradition and relied at various times upon the popularized works of Ariston of Ceos, Bion of Borysthenes, and Chrysippus of Soli, one must wonder whether the Epicurean philosopher (together with his mentor Zeno of Sidon) was violating any of the principles of his school by drawing on outside sources or by using a popularized style. No problem exists, however, as far as style is concerned, since Epicurus himself wrote his "Letter to Menoeceus" in a very rhetorical style. Wolfgang Schmid in his "Epikur" (Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, V, 1962; col. 710) comments that the rhetorical nature of this letter appears "...vor allem in der sorgfältigen Meidung des Hiats, in der an Isokrates gemahnenden pointierten Antithetik u. in dem wohlbedachten Periodenbau (wobei gegen den letzten Punkt nicht etwa die Tatsache geltend gemacht werden darf, dass der Schluss des Briefes zB. durch Einsprengsel u. Ausfälle etwas in Unordnung geraten ist)."[313] Many additional rhetorical devices can be added to this list; especially prominent are those traits commonly associated with Gorgias and his followers (cf. J. D. Denniston, Greek Prose Style, Oxford, rep. 1965; pp. 10-12 and E. Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa, Leipzig, 1909, I, pp. 63 ff.) and which occur in too studied a fashion to be accidental. For example, isocolon is found in the opening sentence of the work, which reads "Μήτε νέος τις ὢν μελλέτω φιλοσοφεῖν, μήτε γέρων ὑπάρχων κοπιάτω φιλοσοφῶν....," and which also is notable for its anaphora and antithesis.[314] Homoeoteleuton and antithesis join isocolon in (122, 7-9), "...τῷ μὲν ὅπως γηράσκων νεάζῃ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς διὰ τὴν χάριν τῶν γεγονότων, τῷ δὲ ὅπως νέος ἅμα καὶ παλαιὸς ᾖ διὰ τὴν ἀφοβίαν τῶν μελλόντων....," two phrases notable for their well-planned parallel structure. Additional examples of isocolon and homoeoteleuton used together include (123, 10-11), "ἀσεβὴς δὲ οὐχ ὁ τοὺς τῶν πολλῶν θεοῦς ἀναιρῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας θεοῖς προσάπτων....," in which the figure antithesis appears as well, and (125, 4-5), "...οὐχ ὅτι λυπήσει παρών, ἀλλ' ὅτι λυπεῖ μέλλων. ὃ γὰρ παρὸν οὐκ ἐνοχλεῖ, προσδοκώμενον κενῶς λυπεῖ."[315] One also finds homoeoteleuton without isocolon, as in (124, 11-125, 1), "...οὐκ ἄπειρον προστιθεῖσα χρόνον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανασίας ἀφελομένη πόθον....," and (128, 9-10) "τότε γὰρ ἡδονῆς χρείαν ἔχομεν, ὅταν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ παρεῖναι τὴν ἡδονὴν

XUM

ἀλγῶμεν·...." Further, the author employs homoeoptoton in several passages, such as (122, 9-10), "...εἴ περ παρούσης μὲν αὐτῆς πάντα ἔχομεν, ἀπούσης δὲ πάντα πράττομεν εἰς τὸ ταύτην ἔχειν....," in which the parallel structure and paronomasia (see footnote 310) are obvious, and (127, 8-10), "ἀναλογιστέον δὲ ὡς τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἱ μέν εἰσι φυσικαί, αἱ δὲ κεναί, καὶ τῶν φυσικῶν αἱ μὲν ἀναγκαῖαι, αἱ δὲ φυσικαὶ μόνον·...."[316]

Various other devices must be mentioned to indicate the rhetorical nature of Epicurus' style in the "Letter to Menoeceus." First of all, the impressive, and obviously contrived, figure chiasmus finds expression in the phrases (128, 5-6), "ὅταν δὲ ἅπαξ τοῦτο περὶ ἡμᾶς γένηται, λύεται πᾶς ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς χειμών,...," where the release of the soul from its storm is emphasized (the word χειμών being surprisingly metaphorical),[317] as well as in (130, 2-4), "χρώμεθα γὰρ τῷ μὲν ἀγαθῷ κατά τινας χρόνους ὡς κακῷ, τῷ δὲ κακῷ τἄμπαλιν ὡς ἀγαθῷ....," and (132, 10-11), "...ἡδέως ζῆν ἄνευ τοῦ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως <οὐδὲ φρονίμως καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως> ἄνευ τοῦ ἡδέως....," in which polysyndeton also appears. A second artificial figure, paronomasia, adds interest to (122, 2-3), "οὔτε γὰρ ἄωρος οὐδείς ἐστιν οὔτε πάρωρος πρὸς τὸ κατὰ ψυχὴν ὑγιαῖνον." As further examples of this device one may cite (124, 1), "οὐ γὰρ προλήψεις εἰσὶν ἀλλ' ὑπολήψεις ψευδεῖς...," and (135, 2), "...κρεῖττον εἶναι . . . εὐλογίστως ἀτυχεῖν ἢ ἀλογίστως εὐτυχεῖν...," as well as (135, 3-4), "...τὸ καλῶς κριθὲν...ἢ τὸ κακῶς κριθὲν...," and (135, 7), "...οὔθ' ὕπαρ οὔτ' ὄναρ διαταραχθήσῃ....". Epicurus additionally embellishes his work with anaphora, as in (125, 11-12), "...ὁτὲ μὲν ὡς μέγιστον...ὁτὲ δὲ ὡς ἀνάπαυσιν...," and (129, 10-11), "πᾶσα οὖν...,οὐ πᾶσα μέντοι...," and with frequent alliteration in passages such as (127, 3), "...βεβουλευμένον αὐτῷ βεβαίως·...," (129, 3-4),

XUM

"...καταρχόμεθα πάσης αἱρέσεως καὶ φυγῆς καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτην καταντῶμεν ὡς κανόνι τῷ πάθει πᾶν ἀγαθὸν κρίνοντες....," and (132, 9) "...λοιπαὶ πᾶσαι πεφύκασιν ἀρεταί...." Two final devices worthy of note are rhetorical questions and maxims. In section 127, 1-2, for instance, one finds the query, "εἰ μὲν γὰρ πεποιθὼς τοῦτό φησι, πῶς οὐκ ἀπέρχεται τοῦ ζῆν;," with which Epicurus challenges an unnamed opponent, presumably a Cyrenaic.[318] The second rhetorical question is (133, 1-7) too lengthy to include here but is especially notable for its many parallel phrases. Under the rubric "maxims," one may list the one apparent quotation in the work (126, 11) "'φύντα δ' ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας Ἀίδαο περῆσαι....," as well as sayings, presumably created by Epicurus himself, which have the necessary qualities of brevity and memorableness. Examples of such aphorisms are (123, 10-11), "ἀσεβὴς δὲ οὐχ ὁ τοὺς τῶν πολλῶν θεοὺς ἀναιρῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας θεοῖς προσάπτων...," and (125, 1-2), "οὐθὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ζῆν δεινὸν τῷ κατειληφότι γνησίως τὸ μηδὲν ὑπάρχειν ἐν τῷ μὴ ζῆν δεινόν." These and similar statements easily can be taken out of context and used independently without being deprived of their significance.

Despite the prevalence of such embellishments the "Letter to Menoeceus" obviously is not a diatribe, but rather is a protreptic work written with the alleged intention of exhorting a young man to study the Epicurean philosophy and, as Ettore Bignone has observed, "il manifesto e programma filosophico di Epicuro, in antigonismo e in emulazione del Protrettico di Aristotele...."[319] The diatribe and protrepticus, of course, are slightly related in the sense that both are exhortatory and epideictic in character, but, while the diatribe is a rather loosely constructed, homiletic form, dealing with practical ethics, the protrepticus is "...an exhortation to some general course - philosophy, rhetoric, virute....," and "it gives a comprehensive view, setting forth the advantages and removing the objections ...."[320] Within Epicurus' work, however, appear several themes which are treated in diatribes of Bion and Teles or which seem related to comments made by Diogenes of Sinope. For example, the "Letter to Menoeceus" includes one passage dealing with *autarcheia* in terms of desires and, in stressing the well-known Epicurean doctrine concerning natural and necessary pleasures (on which see J. M. Rist, *Epicurus*, *An Introduction*, Cambridge, 1972; pp. 116 ff.), features the following comment (130, 10-131, 2):

> οἱ γὰρ λιτοὶ χυλοὶ ἴσην πολυτελεῖ διαίτῃ τὴν
> ἀηδίαν ἐπιφέρουσιν, ὅταν ἅπαν τὸ ἀλγοῦν κατ᾽ ἔνδειαν
> ἐξαιρεθῇ· καὶ μάζα καὶ ὕδωρ τὴν ἀκροτάτην ἀποδίδωσιν
> ἡδονήν, ἐπειδὰν ἐνδέων τις αὐτὰ προσενέγκηται.

The similarity in doctrine between this passage and the famous *prosopopoiia* (see above at footnotes 104 and 125) of *Penia* by Bion is quite evident but cannot be used to prove dependence on the part of Bion, since the theme of *autarcheia* and the simple life is common to both philosophies.[321] Further, the Epicurean concern with banishing the fear of death (124, 7-126, 5) can be compared with the discussion of Bion concerning the proper attitude toward death (see above at footnotes 130-133), which, however, does not concern itself with deep philosophical questions but only with common-sense observations. Once again, one cannot postulate Epicurus as a source for Bion since the topic concerned is a general one of common interest to various schools. A final interesting correspondence is that between the concluding sentence of Epicurus' "Letter to Menoeceus," which reads (135, 8-9) "οὐθὲν γὰρ ἔοικε θνητῷ ζῴῳ ζῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀθανάτοις ἀγαθοῖς.," and the comment, attributed by Diogenes Laertius (VI, 104) to Diogenes of Sinope, which observes that

XUM

"...θεῶν μὲν ἴδιον εἶναι μηδενὸς δεῖσθαι, τῶν δὲ θεοῖς ὁμοίων τὸ ὀλίγων χρῄζειν." Both of these sayings resemble the diatribal themes described by André Oltramare (*Les Origines de la Diatribe Romaine*, Lausanne, 1926; p. 58) as "le sage est *semblable aux dieux*, puisqu' il n'a besoin de rien...," and "le sage a la vraie *gloire* et la vraie *noblesse*...," if one assumes that one who follows the precepts expressed in the "Letter to Menoeceus" becomes a wise man. One, however, cannot assume that Epicurus modeled his conclusion on that of Diogenes or that he even knew the remark by the Cynic, for the sentiments expressed are of a general enough, although important, nature to preclude the necessity of imitation.[322]

It is difficult (and indeed hazardous to try) to ascertain whether Epicurus had any influence on the development of the diatribe or whether any of his immediate followers used the genre. The eclectic nature of the diatribes of Bion and later writers and the general nature of some of the themes expressed by Democritus, Epicurus, and other Epicureans, leave open the possibilities that some Epicurean themes found their way into these homiletic works[323] or that some diatribal themes found their way into later Epicurean writings, such as those of Zeno of Sidon and Philodemus, and were compatible enough with Epicurean doctrine to be used without any qualms on the part of orthodox Epicureans. One cannot assume, however, that the Cynics, to whom the diatribe seems to owe its fullest development, and the Epicureans were in agreement on major points of doctrine, for the evidence forces a different conclusion. As D. R. Dudley has observed in his *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.* (p. 106), Epicurus himself wrote several comments directed against the Cynics, such as that one paraphrased in Diogenes Laertius (X, 119) and stating that

Epicurus wrote that the wise man "οὐδὲ τυραννεύσειν· οὐδὲ κυνιεῖν...· οὐδὲ πτωχεύσειν....," or the remark (Diogenes Laertius, X, 8) that "τούς τε Κυνικοὺς ἐχθροὺς τῆς Ἑλλάδος·...," which, incidentally, occurs in the same passage in which Epicurus is recorded as having referred to Democritus as "Ληρόκριτον." Dudley further notes (p. 106) that "this hostility was probably due to the repugnance Epicurus felt to the Cynic ἀναίδεια; certainly the life of the Epicurean Sage avoided the Cynic παραχάραξις of established law and convention." The Cynics, on their part, were equally hostile, for Diogenes Laertius (VI, 101) records the fact that the Cynic Menippus wrote works concerning, and presumably ridiculing, "Γονὰς Ἐπικούρου καὶ Τὰς θρησκευομένας ὑπ᾽αὐτῶν εἰκάδας."[324] In addition, Menedemus, a former pupil of Colotes the Epicurean (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 102), became a Cynic and carried on a dispute with Colotes over the Epicurean views concerning poetry (Dudley, p. 107). Menedemus, of course, if Diogenes Laertius is to be believed (VI, 102), was a typical Cynic in his disregard for convention and public opinion, but rather atypical in his choice of apparel which included a chiton "...φαιὸς ποδήρης, περὶ αὐτῷ ζώνη φοινικῆ,...," topped off with an Arcadian cap decorated by "...ἐνυφασμένα τὰ δώδεκα στοιχεῖα...," to which he added the felt half-boots of a tragic actor (cf., however, D. R. Dudley, p. 61).

One other Epicurean should be mentioned here as possibly having a place in the history of the diatribe, despite the assumed hostility between Cynics and Epicureans. In Cicero's Tusculan Disputations (IV, iii, 6) one finds the name of Gaius Amafinius,[325] the Epicurean, by whose works "...commota multitudo contulit se ad eam potissimum disciplinam, sive quod erat cognitu perfacilis, sive quod invitabantur illecebris blandas voluptatis, sive etiam, quia nihil erat prolatum melius, illud, quod erat, tenebant." Amafinius was succeeded, according to Cicero (Ibid., IV, iii, 7) by many "...eiusdem aemuli rationis multa cum scripsissent, Italiam totam occupaverunt....". Despite any exaggerations by Cicero one can glean from his account that the works of Amafinius and his followers were of a popular nature. Whether these writings were at all similar to diatribes or whether they took the form of the popular letters of Epicurus cannot be determined.

E. Menippus and Varro

Now that one strain of the diatribe's development has been traced down from Bion through Teles, Ariston, and Philodemus, one must examine briefly the line extending from Bion to Menippus, and from one or both of these to several early Roman writers. Concerning Menippus, first of all, Diogenes Laertius has little to report. This Cynic allegedly was a Phoenician by birth and a slave of one Baton of Pontus, until (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 99) "ἀτηρότερον δ᾽αἰτῶν ὑπὸ φιλαργυρίας ἴσχυσε Θηβαῖος γενέσθαι." Significantly, Diogenes notes (VI, 99) that Menippus had no "σπουδαῖον" and that his books "...πολλοῦ καταγέλωτος γέμει....". These books apparently numbered thirteen and included titles such as (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 101) "Νέκυια," "Διαθῆκαι," "Ἐπιστολαὶ κεκομψευμέναι ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν θεῶν προσώπου," "Πρὸς τοὺς φυσικοὺς καὶ μαθηματικοὺς καὶ γραμματικούς," "Γονὰς Ἐπικούρου," and "Τὰς θρησκευομένας ὑπ᾽αὐτῶν εἰκάδας," to which list Diogenes adds the comment "καὶ ἄλλα," indicating, of course, that he has not listed all thirteen works. One additional title is mentioned by this compiler in his life of Diogenes of Sinope, where (VI, 29) he records an anecdote concerning the famous Cynic and notes that it is found "...ἐν τῇ Διογένους Πράσει..." by Menippus.[326]

XUM

Information concerning the nature of these works can be drawn, with caution, from the fragments of Varro or the dialogues of Lucian, imitator of Menippus. The *Nekyia*, for example, seems to have involved a trip to the underworld by Menippus himself, who wished to visit Tiresias,[327] for the Cynic himself reports on his trip to Hades, when he is called back by Lucian in the *Menippus* (1), and claims, quoting the *Odyssey* (IX, 164);

> Ὦ φιλότης, χρειώ με κατήγαγεν εἰς Ἀΐδαο
> ψυχῇ χρησόμενον Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο.

Further evidence of the nature of the *Nekyia* seems to be found in Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead* (see footnote 327), for Diogenes of Sinope asks Pollux to invite *Menippus* to the underworld (1.1) since "...ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐ παύσῃ βεβαίως γελῶν καθάπερ ἐγὼ νῦν..." and describes (1.2) the Cynic by saying "...γελᾷ δ' ἀεὶ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τοὺς ἀλαζόνας τούτους φιλοσόφους ἐπισχώπτει." In the second *Dialogue of the Dead* Menippus then appears and addresses Charon, as his journey begins (2.1). Another work of the Cynic, the *Diathekai* may have been a collection of wills drawn up for philosophers,[328] which Varro's Menippean satire *Testamentum* perhaps reflects. Evidence for the nature of a third work by Menippus, the *Epistolai* listed by Diogenes Laertius, may be found in the possibility that this collection was the model for Lucian's *Letters of Cronos* in which, as D. R. Dudley observes (*A History of Cynicism*; p. 72), "Lucian confines himself to satire on the importunate nature of human prayer, and the conflict between the rich and poor." Finally, the *Sale of Diogenes*, mentioned by Diogenes Laertius in his life of Diogenes of Sinope, may have been the source for Lucian's *Sale of Creeds* (cf. Dudley, p. 71), although Ragnar Hõistad has stated concerning section 8 of this dialogue, in his *Cynic Hero and Cynic King* (p. 72), that "the dialogue between Diogenes and the auctioneer, if we disregard the ironical tone, is so full of Cynic elements that we cannot exclude the possibility of earlier, pre-Menippean sources, whether or not Menippus was the intermediary."

Additional information concerning Menippus can be assembled from other sources. Athenaeus, for example, records the fact (XIV, 629 E-F) that "καλεῖται δέ τις καὶ ἄλλη ὄρχησις κόσμου ἐκπύρωσις, ἧ μνημονεύει Μένιππος ὁ κυκικὸς ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ.," and thereby provides the name of another work by the Cynic, as well as a brief fragment of his writing.[329] Another title is provided by Athenaeus when he notes (XIV, 664 E) that Menippus the Cynic in his Arcesilaus wrote, "...πότος ἦν ἐπικωμασάντων τινῶν καὶ ματτύην ἐκέλευσεν εἰσφέρειν Λάκαινάν τίς· καὶ εὐθέως περιεφέρετο περδίκεια ὀλίγα καὶ χήνεια ὀπτὰ καὶ τρύφη πλακούντων."[330] Rudolf Helm in his Lucian und Menipp (Leipzig, 1906; p. 89) comments that in his Arcesilaus Menippus probably mocked the skeptical point of view, although, of course, no real information concerning the content of the work can be gleaned from this fragment concerning banquet food. One other important reference to Menippus is found in Strabo (XVI, 759, ed. A. Meineke, 1852, rep. 1969) who calls the Cynic "spoudaiogeloios," in contrast to Diogenes Laertius, who, as was noted above, thinks that seriousness is lacking in the works of Menippus.

The references which have been cited thus far tell one little about the actual work of Menippus. Attempts have been made to judge the style of the Cynic writer on the basis of that of his imitators Varro and Lucian, who even wrote a dialogue entitled Menippus. As D. R. Dudley has remarked, however, "the classical theory of Imitation demanded that in handling a particular literary genre an author should conform to a more or less definite framework, but it offered plenty of scope for originality in detail. It is not therefore likely that from the dialogues of Lucian we can reconstruct in any detail the Menippean original."[332] Further, the *Saturae Menippeae* of the Roman author M. Terentius Varro are in a fragmentary state which hinders any attempt to draw significant conclusions about the Cynic whom Varro seems to have imitated closely. D. R. Dudley continues his discussion of the reconstruction of Menippus' work with the observation (p. 73) that "the literary importance of Menippus is that he developed for comic purposes two genres previously monopolized by Philosophy - the dialogue and the letter." Concerning Menippus use of the letter there seems to be little doubt, since letters by him are listed by Diogenes Laertius (VI, 101), who also notes Menippus' lack of seriousness. The Cynic's use of the dialogue form, however, has not been demonstrated and, indeed, seems to be placed in doubt by the very comments of Lucian, in his *Bis Accusatus*, 33, which commonly are advanced as proof that the Cynic did use this genre (cf. Dudley, pp. 73-74). In Lucian's *Bis Accusatus* the personified figure of Dialogue complains about his degradation by Lucian, who his referred to as "the Syrian." Dialogue states that "the Syrian" has taken away the "...τραγικὸν ἐκεῖνο καὶ σωφρονικὸν προσωπεῖον..." replacing it with one that is "...κωμικὸν δὲ καὶ σατυρικὸν...," and that, after adding "...τὸ σκῶμα καὶ τὸν ἴαμβον καὶ κυνισμὸν..." as well as Eupolis and Aristophanes, Lucian has brought in Menippus, a "dog" who "...γελῶν ἅμα ἔδακνεν." Further, complains the angry genre, through the interference of Lucian, now "...κωμῳδῶν καὶ γελωτοποῖων..., κρᾶσίν τινα παράδοξον κέκραμαι καὶ οὔτε πεζός εἰμι οὔτε ἐπὶ τῶν μέτρων βέβηκα, ἀλλὰ ἱπποκενταύρου δίκην σύνθετοντι...," an obvious reference to the mixture of prose and verse characteristic of the genre known as the Menippean satire (cf. Dudley, p. 70 and 74). Lucian replies in his own defense (34) that he found the dialogue "...σκυθρωπὸν ἔτι τοῖς πολλοῖς δοκοῦντα καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν συνεχῶν ἐρωτήσεων κατεσκληκότα....". While in this work Lucian, perhaps, was giving himself credit for many innovations which he could have exaggerated (cf. Ludwig Edelstein, "Primum Graius Homo (Lucretius I, 66)," TAPA, 71 (1940) 78-90), it still would be rather strange for his personified Dialogue to refer to Menippus as being brought into the genre by Lucian, if Menippus had indeed written famous dialogues in which he included a mixture of prose and verse. That Menippus did mingle poetry and prose is attested, of course, by the work of his imitator Varro, who also may have used a dialogue form in some of his works (cf. A. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 101). Obviously the problem is quite complicated and made worse by the lack of fragments of Menippus himself. Possibly the most that one should say of this Cynic is that he seems to have displayed the mixture of humor and seriousness (spoudaiogeloion) common to Crates, Bion, and other Cynics, with more emphasis, however, on the humorous, to have followed Cynic doctrine in his attacks on other schools and on superstitions (on which see A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 39) and in his representation of Diogenes, and to have employed the genre of the letter as well as a genre which mixed prose and verse and in which dialogue could have occurred, possibly in a fashion similar to its use in the *Apocolocyntosis divi Claudii* of Seneca or in the *Satyricon* of *Petronius*, both of which feature dialogue within their narratives but which cannot be classed as dialogues.[333]

The question of whether any influence stemming from Bion reached Menippus is equally difficult to answer. Certainly other Cynics, besides Bion, used *spoudaiogeloion* and possibly, in the case of Crates at least, made frequent use of poetic quotations in their public harangues, a tendency which could have influenced Menippus in the development of his artistic mixture of prose and verse. Further, the use of a *prosopopoiia* of *Dialogue*

XUM

by Lucian in his *Bis Accusatus* tempts one to assume that Menippus influenced the Syrian in his choice of this device, but such an assumption is patently faulty, since the very rhetorical Lucian could have used the *prosopopoiia* because of his own inclinations and training rather than because he found the figure in Menippus. Other traits commonly appearing in the diatribe, such as maxims, personifications, rational explanations of myths, a polemic tone, and various rhetorical figures, are found in Varro (see Oltramare, p. 101 and the discussion of Varro below) and perhaps can be traced to Menippus, although other sources of influence cannot be discounted. If these traits in the Roman author do have Menippus as a source, then the Cynic writer does fit into the tradition basically established by Bion and may have felt his influence. Further, if Menippus included dialogue within his work but did not use dialogue as a genre, he also on that account fits into the tradition of Bion and possibly of Teles (see above after footnote 138), whose use of the genre is also doubtful.[334] All of these possibilities, however, cannot be proved, just as one cannot prove that Menippus did or did not write dialogues. Perhaps Menippus represents a development, connected with Bion only through a common background, in which Cynic themes, *spoudaiogeloion* (cf. Lucian, *Bis Accusatus*, 33, where Dialogue says of Menippus "...καὶ γελῶν ἅμα ἔδακνεν."), and various popular devices, were combined with dialogue, possibly influenced by comedy or the mime (cf. Helm, *Lucian und Menipp*, p. 344), and an artistic mixture of prose and verse perhaps freshly composed by the author, perhaps quoted from others, or perhaps written as a parody, to form a new genre which came to be known as the Menippean satire. Whether this genre resembled the traditional dialogue at all, or the dialogues of Lucian, cannot be determined with certainty since all of the evidence is inconclusive. The form developed by Menippus could have resembled the diatribe in many ways but still have remained a separate genre. It should be stressed, further, that Menippus also may have used the diatribe, as well as the literary genres of the letter and perhaps even the dialogue, although no evidence exists to support that contention. The work of Menippus has deserved mention in this study of the diatribe since, even though not diatribal in genre, it reveals the use of Cynic themes and the tone of spoudaiogeloion in a genre which seems to have sprung from the same roots as the diatribe.

Closely connected with Menippus is M. Terentius Varro, who must be discussed briefly to demonstrate the influence of Menippus, and perhaps also of his contemporary Meleager (on whom see Diogenes Laertius, VI, 101, and A. Oltramare, op. cit., 100), on a prolific and respected Roman writer. Varro, who referred to Menippus as "...ille nobilis quondam canis...,"[336] called his own "satiric medley's" Saturae Menippeae and was himself called "Menippeus" or "Cynicus" because of his admitted imitation of the Cynic author.[337] How close an imitation this was is indicated by a remark made by Cicero, who writes (Academica Post., 8, ed. Plasberg, rep. 1961, Teubner; cited by Rudolf Hirzel, Der Dialog, I, Leipzig, 1895, p. 380, note 3), "in illis veteribus nostris, quae Menippum imitati, non interpretati, quadam hilaritate conspersimus, quo facilius minus docti intellegerent, incunditate quadam ad legendum invitati, multa admixta ex intima philosophia, multa dicta dialectice." Further information concerning the nature of Varro's work is provided by Quintilian (X, i, 95, ed. L. Radermacher, Teubner, 1959), who, in a section concerning Roman satire, observes, "alterum illud etiam prius satirae genus, sed non sola carminum varietate mixtum condidit Terentius Varro, vir Romanorum eruditissimus. Plurimos hic libros et doctissimos composuit, peritissimus linguae Latinae et omnis antiquitatis et rerum

XUM

Graecarum nostrarumque, plus tamen scientiae collaturus quam eloquentiae."[338] Unfortunately, these satires, which could have preserved the essence of the work of Menippus, are themselves scarcely preserved, and one can gleam from the fragments of Varro's satires only a few themes which seem to represent Cynic views and some idea of the style of Varro which may bear the imprint of that of Menippus, although one cannot exclude the possibility of influence from the Stoic Ariston, whose περὶ γήρως (or *Tithonus*) may have been a model for Varro's *Tithonus* (but cf. Hellfried Dahlmann, op. cit. in footnote 206, pp. 37 ff. on the possibility of a common source for Varro and Ariston), or from Antisthenes, whose *Heracles* was followed by Varro in his *Prometheus Liber* (on which see A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 101).

The likelihood exists, first of all, that Varro used dialogue within his satires and possibly wrote some actual dialogues. As A. Oltramare has observed (p. 101), in spite of the frequent use of indirect discourse, "...la forme dialoguée de toutes les satires apparaît nettement et, comme dans les textes diatribiques grecs, oblige à attribuer certaines phrases de sens anticynique aux interlocuteurs mis en scène pour recevoir des leçons de sagesse."[339] For example, fragment 518, which reads "sed ut canis sine coda," seems to represent the remark of someone against the Cynic (see Oltramare, op. cit., p. 102), while in fragment 84 the author seems to be answering a comment made by an Epicurean when he states that the world is neither born nor does it die.[340] The comment from Cicero quoted above, of course, is evidence for the use of dialogue, as are passages of direct address, such as (fragment 66) "non te pudet Mani, cum domi tuae vides commilitonum tuorum cohortes servis tuis ministrare caementa?" Further, the frequent use of the second person also may be indicative of conversation, although one must allow for a possible general address to the reader or to

XUM

an imaginary interlocutor.[341] The disjointed nature of fragments naturally makes such distinctions difficult if not impossible, but, since one can be reasonably certain that some satires are dialogues, one can generally assume the presence of an actual interlocutor or of interlocutors. One final interesting characteristic of Varro's use of this form is his tendency to address remarks to himself, such as (fr. 60), "ebrius es, Marce: Odyssian enim Homeri ruminari incipis, cum περὶ τρόπων scripturum te Seio receperis." Concerning this tendency Michel Ruch in his *Le Préambule dans les Oeuvres Philosophiques de Cicéron* (Paris, 1958; p. 68) aptly has observed that some satires are a conversation of the author with himself and that "...Platon avait bien considéré toute pensée comme un dialogue intérieur, résultant d'un dédoublement de la personnalité." The address by the author to himself found in fragment 60, however, appears in a dialogue in which at least one other interlocutor, an unidentified Manius, is found. Perhaps nearer to Ruch's description is the remark (fr. 175) which appears in the *Flaxtabula* and states, "Quare, o Marce, pransum ac paratum esse te hoc minumo oportet."

The mixture of prose and verse is also well-attested, in Quintilian's comment, for example, and easily illustrated from the fragments of the Roman writer, although the exact order of many fragments cannot be ascertained. In the *All' ou menei se*, for example, one finds the prose fragment (22) "etenim quibus seges praebeat domum, escam, potionem, quid desideremus?," as well as the following verses of poetry (fr. 21):

Quem secuntur cum rutundis velitis leves parmis,
Antesignani quadratis multisignibus tecti.

Other examples of this well-known trait need not be given here, but one should take note of the fact that this stylistic mixture does not prevent the author from including verse quotations within prose passages. For instance, fragment 40 ("Non modo vinum dare, sed etiam, ut Plautus ait, 'murinam, passum, defrutum.'") contains a quotation from Plautus, while in fragment 189 Ennius is quoted. The use of the prose and verse mixture and the possible dialogue form should be derived from Menippus himself (cf. Oltramare, p. 101), and, therefore, perhaps can be assumed to provide a reasonably accurate, if limited, picture of the genre of Menippean satire. Further, the probability that only a limited number, if any, of Varro's satires were written as dialogues is increased by the fact that they later were called Saturae Menippeae rather than dialogi. Possibly some of the satires were dialogues but still contained the Menippean medley of prose and verse as well as other Cynic traits or perhaps Cicero's remarks should be assumed to refer only to dialogue within a satire, rather than to a separate genre. The fragmentary state of the evidence again makes certainty impossible.

Other stylistic traits, most of which are of a popular nature and which probably stem from the influence of Menippus and his Cynic background, can be observed in the fragments of Varro. Of special importance are the "personnifications allegoriques," as Oltramare (p. 101) calls them, which appear in several passages. Fragment 147 (cf. Oltramare, p. 101) provides an example in its use of Existimatio ("Forenses decernunt, ut Existimatio nomen meum in sanorum numerum referat."), while the personification of Veritas is obvious in the passage (fr. 141; cf. Oltramare, p. 101), "et ecce de improviso ad nos accedit cana Veritas, Attices philosophiae alumna." More vivid than either of these is the figure of Infamia in the following verses (fr. 123; cf. Oltramare, p. 101):

tertia Poenarum
Infamia stans nixa in vulgi
pectore flutanti, intonsa coma,
sordida vestitu, ore severo.

A personification more closely allied with Cynic tradition than any of these others are is that of *Fortuna* appearing in the verses (fr. 288):

> nemini Fortuna currum a carcere intimo missum
> labi inoffensum per aecor candidum ad
> calcem sivit[342]

The frequent use of τυχή in a similar fashion has already been observed in Bion (see above at footnote 107). None of these personifications is a true *prosopcpoiia*, such as that in which Bion has *Penia* speak, but each seems, rather, to be what Servius, commenting on the famous personification of *Fama* in Vergil (*Aeneid*, IV, 174 ff.), calls a *somatopoiia*, a term which is defined by Cassiodorus (in his exposition of Psalm 84, 11, in *Expositio Psalmorum* LXXI-CL, ed. M. Adriaen, *Corpus Christianorum*, *Series Latina*, XCVIII, 1958) as "...corpus attributio, quando rebus incorporeis corpora tribuuntur....," a definition resembling the modern conception of personification in which the allegorical figure need not speak.[344] Such personifications do seem to have had a place in the diatribe, as Bion's use of *Tyche* indicates, and as is demonstrated for the later tradition by the vivid personification of anger by Plutarch (*de Cohibenda Ira*, 458. D; cf. Oltramare, p. 14) who describes the feeling as, "...δήγμασι χειλῶν καὶ πρίσεσιν ὀδόντων καὶ κεναῖς ἐπιδρομαῖς καὶ βλασφημίαις ἀπειλὰς ἀνοήτους ἐχούσαις καταναλισκόμενον...κτλ." Whether one should ascribe the *somatopoiiae* in Varro to Menippus and the Cynic diatribal tradition, however, is a questionable matter, since this figure seems to be such a common one (see above at footnotes 104 and 105) in poetry that a writer such as Varro would not have needed to rely on the diatribe or Menippus for a model, although it is possible that he did. In addition to the *somotopoiiae* which have been mentioned, one finds in one Varronian fragment a personification of *Metamelos* which may be a remnant of a *prosopopoiia*. Fragment 239 observes "ad biviram venio. cum vellem ostendere, quid vellem, Metamelos Inconstantiae filius me reprehendit." If one translates *reprehendit* as "reproves," then the possibility exists that the words of *Metamelos* were reproduced in some lines now lost and that this section, then, was a *prosopopoiia* which, in its use of *Metamelos* may have been derived from Menippus. The scanty evidence, however, prevents one from drawing a definite conclusion.

Another important trait found in Varro is the rational explanation of myths (Oltramare, p. 101), a tendency which, of course, is by no means limited to the diatribe, as, for example, the beginning of Herodotus indicates (I, 1 ff., ed. C. Hude, Oxford, 3rd ed. 1927, rep. 1967).[345] The use of this method of instruction within the Cynic tradition can be found already in Diogenes of Sinope who, according to Stobaeus, gave a rationalized account of the myth of Medea in which he described her as a σοφή, "...ἀλλ' οὐ φαρμακίδα...." and said that, taking men who were soft and "...τὰ σώματα διεφθαρμένους...," Medea made them strong and vigorous through "...τρυφῆς ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις καὶ τοῖς πυριατηρίοις...· ὅθεν περὶ αὐτῆς ῥῦηναι τὴν δόξαν, ὅτι τὰ κρέα ἕψουσα νέους ἐποίει."[346] Closely connected with the rationalizing tendency must be the use of references to figures from mythology or poetic quotations involving such figures which are used to express a moral thought (cf. Oltramare, p. 16). The description of Tantalus, found in Teles (p. 34, 9 ff.) and probably derived from Bion, provides a good example of this trait, for after the sufferings of Tantalus are indicated briefly, with the help of two Homeric quotations, the author then comments (Teles, p. 35, 2-5), "...οὕτως ἐνίων ἡ ἀνελευθερία καὶ δυσελπιστία καὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὴν ὀπώραν ῥίπτασκεν, οὐ ποτὶ νέφεα ἀλλ' ἃ μὲν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἃ δὲ εἰς τὸ καπηλεῖον, καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντες οὐδενὸς γεύονται." Both the rationalizing of myths and the using of mythological examples seem to have had a place in the work of Varro and probably were derived from the Cynic tradition. Fragment 285, for instance, refers to the same myth concerning Medea as that used by Diogenes and cited above, when it states (cf. Oltramare, p. 101, note 6), "Pelian Medeae permississe, ut se vel vivum degluberet, dum modo redderet puellum." Oltramare (op. cit., p. 101) includes this passage among the "explications rationalistes de mythes," but the surviving fragments of this section do not allow one to make any assumptions concerning the nature of the rationalization, although it may have been similar to that of Diogenes (but cf. E. Norden, In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae, Leipzig, 1891; p. 268). Also among the myths listed by Oltramare (p. 101) is that of Prometheus found in fragments 423-436 of Varro's Menippean Satires. After references to Prometheus' confinement appears the following description of the creation of man (fr. 428):

> humanae quandam gentem stirpis concoquit,
> frigus calore atque umore aritudinem
> miscet,

a passage which precedes the fragment (429), "cum sumere coepisset, voluptas detineret, cum sat haberet, satias manum de mensa tolleret." The Prometheus myth may have been used here to explain certain human traits or, as Oltramare seems to suggest (p. 101), it may have been used as an example of the theme (p. 51) "il faut revenir à la vertu des sociétés primitives." Oltramare's suggestion seems plausible, but one cannot know whether, in addition, this section on Prometheus contained an actual rationalization of the myth, unless one counts as rationalization any attempt to use myth in a moralizing fashion, which, perhaps, one should do. One final myth deserving of mention is that of Tithonus, who is used by Varro in a satire concerning old age,

XUM

probably, following Ariston of Chios, who wrote a περὶ γήρως in which Tithonus seems to have taken a prominent part (see above at footnote 206). Through comments such as (fr. 544),

> qua voluptate aevitatis extimam attigit metam,

apparently made by Tithonus, the author expresses the theme, common in Cynic literature (see below following footnote 127), that old age is not an evil (cf. Oltramare, pp. 48 and 101), and thus uses the myth of Tithonus in a rationalized fashion to express a moral.

In addition to the other traits which have been mentioned, the use of maxims by Varro is another indication of the popular nature of his satires (cf. Oltramare, p. 101; cf. Buecheler, p. 277, who lists some of the maxims in Varro, including the titles of several satires). The term maxim is intended here, of course, to include not only obvious proverbs, but any statement expressed in such a concise and pointed form that it is easily remembered. Fragment 208, for example, remarks, "qui sint secundum naturam perfecti homines, ut non modo eos spectemus sed etiam imitemur....," perhaps a reference to the Cynics, but certainly succinctly expressed (cf. Otramare, p. 100). A similar maxim is (fr. 321), "non eos optume vixisse qui diutissime vixent, sed qui modestissime." In fragment 241, further, is found the indisputable comment, revealing the author's agricultural bent, "neque in bona segate nullum est spicum nequam, neque in mala non aliquod bonum."[347] Several maxims quoted in Greek are found in the midst of Latin fragments or serving as titles for fragments. For instance, fragment 320 (cf. Buechler, p. 277, "proverbia") aska, "Quid aliud est quod Delphice cantat columna litteris suis ἄγαν μηθέν? iudam nos facere adit mortalem modum medioxime, ut quondam patres nostri loquebantur." A less familiar proverb

XUM

is (fr. 381; cf. Buecheler, p. 277-278), "quare residi lingulacae optrectatores tui iam nunc murmurantes dicunt: μωμήσεταί τις μᾶλλον ἢ μιμήσεται." Finally, an obvious use of a maxim as a title is *gnothi seauton*, the title for fragments 199-210 (cf. Buecheler, p. 278 and Oltramare, p. 101). Such proverbial titles also occur in Latin, as is shown by "cras credo, hodie nihil," the title for fragments 77-78, and "longe fugit qui suos fugit," which preceeds fragments 244-245 and also appears in Petronius' *Satyricon* (43.6; cf. Buecheler, p. 277, "proverbia,"). Whether any of these sayings were also used by Menippus is difficult to determine, and one must be satisfied with the probability that Varro derived the use of maxims as a stylistic and didactic device from the Cynic.

Closely connected with the use of maxims is the employment of anecdotes which also tend to stress an idea by illustrating it in a pointed fashion. The fragments of the satire entitled *Marcipor* include the partial sentence (fr. 281), "et Diogenes cynicos, qui ab Alexandro rege iussus optare quid vellet, se facturum," an obvious reference to the famous anecdote, recorded by Diogenes Laertius (VI, 38), in which Diogenes of Sinope, asked by Alexander the Great to request of him whatever he wished, replied, "'ἀποσκότησόν μου,'" thereby showing his independence. A typically Roman anecdote also appears in a satire concerned with suicide (περὶ ἐξαγωγῆς; cf. Oltramare, p. 105, note 7 on the theme). In fragment 407 Hannibal, asked "cur biberit medicamentum...," replies "...quia Romanis...me Prusiades tradere volebat." This second passage may represent Varro's "Romanization" of a Menippean original, influenced, no doubt, by his own training in rhetoric which may have featured Hannibal as a standard example.[348]

Another trait common in Cynic writings is the use of brief character sketches as a vivid means of expressing a thought (see above at footnote 90 ff.).

Such brief characterizations also appear in Varro and probably can be traced back to the influence of Menippus, especially since these sketches often reveal the *spoudaiogeloion* for which the Cynics, and especially Bion and Menippus, were famous. Within the fragments of Varro's *Eumenides*, for instance, is found the following picture of a greedy man (fr. 126):

> denique qui sanus sit avarus?
> cui si stet *totus* terrai traditus orbis,
> furando tamen a morbo stimulatus eodem
> ex sese ipse aliquid quaerat cogatque peculi....

This same theme occurs later in Horace, *Sermones*, I, 1, and in its connection with dissatisfaction with one's lot seems to reflect the influence of Bion (see above at footnotes 126, 142 and 145) who, perhaps, was influential on Menippus.[349] A second, and related, brief sketch appears in the following reference to a greedy money-lender (fr. 37):

> vulgoque avarus faenerator spe lucri
> rem scriptione duplicarat.

Further, a characterization of a different sort is evident in Varro's (and probably Menippus') attack on the Stoic description of the sage (see Oltramare, p. 102) in which the author comments (fr. 245), "solus rex, solus rhetor, solus formonsus fortis, aecus vel ad aedilicium modium, purus putus: si ad hunc χαρακτῆρα Κλεάνθους conveniet, cave attigeris hominem." A more fitting characterization of the sage, from the Cynic point of view, is the fragment (172), "sapiens et bonum ferre potest modicc et malum fortiter aut leviter," a description reminiscent of the views of Bion and Teles (see below at footnote 146),[350] which, while not really a satiric sketch, still deserves mention in connection with the criticism of the Stoic view. One final characterization which should be included here is that contained in the author's comments on the degeneracy of life in his time as opposed to life

XUM

in past centuries. Within this section of his work, in the satire entitled Modius, Varro describes those men whom Oltramare calls (p. 109) "...les raffinés qui suivent la dernière mod lancée en Grece...," which is (fr. 311) "...coma promissa, rasa barba, pallia trahentes." Possibly a description such as this reflects a Cynic theme concerning excessive luxury in dress (cf. Oltramare, p. 52, theme 39, and p. 109), but Varro has given the topic a specifically Roman treatment, easily inspired by his own indignation.

The characterizations noted above are the major source of spoudaiogeloion within Varro's work, but other traces of bitter humor also deserve mention. Within the satire entitled Anadabatae, for example, one finds the following series of comments which seem intended to present a humorous picture (or at least a facetious one):

(fr. 28) mortales multi rursus ac prorsus meant.

(fr. 29) edepol, idem caecus, non luscitiosus est.

(fr. 30) non mirum si caecuttis, aurum enim non minus
praestringit oculos quam ὁ πολὺς ἄκρατος.

Other probably facetious remarks are made by Varro concerning superstition, when he writes (fr. 278), "ut eat ac rem publicam administret, quod pulli ientent,"[351] and later asks "astrologi non sunt? qui conscribillarunt pingentes caelum?" As a third example of Varro's use of spoudaiogeloion one may cite a passage from his Meleagri in which, after inquiring (fr. 295) whether one hunts "...fructuis an delectationis causa...," he poses the rhetorical question (fr. 296) "sin autem delectationis causa venamini, quanto satius est salvis cruribus in circo spectare quam his descobinatis in silva cursare?" These and other instances of spoudaiogeloion reflect the spirit of Menippus and perhaps also his themes, at least in the sections concerned with wealth and with superstition.[352]

Related to spoudaiogeloion, but not necessarily always found in connection with it, is the polemic tone commonly found in the diatribe and probably also in Menippus. Varro's polemic tone is most prominent in those sections in which he attacks the evils of his own time, thereby making his satires more relevant to his Roman audience but losing nothing in the universal application of his themes. The author's bitterness appears, for instance, in the rhetorical question (fr. 496), "nunc quis patrem decem annorum natus non modo aufert sed tollit - nisi veneno?," a query which is a comment on Varro's previous statement (fr. 495; see Oltramare, p. 107), concerned with the decay of Roman morals, in which the satirist observes, "in quarum locum subierunt inquilinae impietas perfidia impudicitia."[353] Equally bitter is the remark (fr. 227), found in a section of fragments concerning the Civil War (cf. Oltramare, p. 108 on this satire), "singulos lectos stratos ubi habuimus, amisimus propter cariem et tineam." Other passages concern more universal topics, perhaps derived from Menippus. For example, the question (fr. 24), "nos barbari, quod innocentes in gabalum suffigimus homines; vos non barbari, quod noxios obicitis bestiis?," contains an antithesis which gives a rather vehement twist to the Cynic commonplace dealing with varying customs among different races (Oltramare, p. 46, themes 14 and 14a), adapting it here to express condemnation of cruelty or, perhaps also, the fallacy of measuring one crime by another. Also polemic in tone are Varro's warnings concerning love, which probably reflect the Cynic exhortations concerning sexual needs, and adultery (cf. Oltramare, pp. 50-51, themes 32 a-d). In his satire Γνῶθι σεαυτόν the Roman author offers the following poetic warnings:

> (fr. 204) non videtis unus ut
> parvulus Amor ardifeta lampade arida agat amantis
> aestuantis?

XUM

(fr. 205) et rex
et misellus ille pauper amat habetque ignem intus acrem:
hic ephebum mulieravit, hic ad moechada adulescentem
cubiculum pudoris primus polluit.

All of these polemical passages differ from those in which _spoudaiogeloion_ is involved in that they are basically attacks which stress the serious and the bitter and omit the laughter.[354] Other passages are polemic in the sense that they attack schools opposed to Cynicism. The ridicule of the Stoic sage has been mentioned above (fr. 245). Carneades, the Academic philosopher, also comes under attack in two fragments (483 and 484; cf. Oltramare, p. 102), as does Epicurus, in the typical attack (fr. 315), "et hoc interest inter Epicurum et ganeones nostros, quibus modulus est vitae culina."

An additional trait which must be included here is the use of comparisons drawn from the animal world and of a type common in Cynic works (see, for example, above on Bion, at footnotes 100 and 102; cf. Oltramare, p. 104). For instance, Varro mentions sailors moving a swift ship and observes that it goes (fr. 50) "ut levis tippula lymphon frigidos transit lacus." Another flying creature, the stork, appears in the verses (fr. 272),

at nos caduci naufragi ut ciconiae,
quarum bipinnis fulminis plumas vapor
perussit, alte maesti in terram cecidimus.

Further, a more mundane simile is that, occurring in a satire concerned with the acquisition of virtue (_peri aretes kteseos_), which notes,

nam ut ecus qui ad vehendum est natus, tamen hic
traditur magistro,
ut equiso doceat tolutim.

Also to be included with these similes are examples drawn from familiar activities. The satire _Gnothi seauton_ provides the best instance of this type of comparison (which is neither a simile nor a metaphor), since fragment 209 asks "non animadvertis cetarios, cum videre volunt in mari thunnos, escendere in malum alte, ut penitus per aquam perspiciant pisces?," taking from daily life an illustration of the need for observation in attaining a goal.

A few other stylistic devices employed by Varro deserve mention here, since they reveal his rhetorical style. Most prevalent in this author's style are rhetorical questions, many of which have been included in examples illustrating other facets of his work, but as one additional instance the series (fr. 217) "quid est? quid latras? quid rabis? quid vis tibi?" is noteworthy. The second most frequently used figure is alliteration, which often approaches the abuse of Ennius (on which see the Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xii. 18). For example the verse (fr. 56),

> tunc repente caelitum altum tonibribus templum
> tonescit

approaches, but improves on, the famous line, from Ennius,

> O Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne tulisti.[355]

Fragment 160, "patella esurienti posita provocat Neapolitanus piscinas," provides a similar case,[356] as does (fr. 228) "phrygio qui pulvinar poterat pingere, soliar devigibat." Less extreme instances also can be found, such as the alliteration in the following verses (fr. 224):

> detis habenas animae leni,
> dum nos ventus flamine sudo
> suavem ad patriam perducit.

A third important figure is asyndeton which often serves the purpose of emphasis. The remarks concerning the Stoic sage, quoted above, (fr. 245), are an excellent example of this device, as is the enumeration (fr. 263) "...cellae claves claustra carnaria dolia." Equally worthy of mentions is (fr. 432) "...sine osse et nervis, sine pelle, sine pilis puram putam proceram candidam teneram formosam," in which alliteration joins asyndeton.[357]

In addition to the figures listed above one finds anaphora, homoeoteleuton, isocolon, and chiasmus frequently appearing. A prime example of anaphora is provided by the following verses, from the satire entitled Anthropopolis (fr. 36):

> non fit thensauris, non auro pectu'solutum;
> non demunt animis curas ac religiones
> Persarum montes, non atria diviti' Crassi,....

In a similar fashion emphasis is provided by the anaphora with hoc in the metrical section (fr. 111)

> vino nihil incundius quisquam bibit:
> hoc aegritudinem ad medendam invenerunt,
> hoc hilaritatis dulce seminarium,
> hoc continet coagulum conviva.[358]

Anaphora joins homoeoteleuton and homoeoptoton in the fragment, from the Parmeno, (fr. 386), "exeuntis strepunt, exeuntis bount," which probably should be counted as an example of onomotopoeia as well. Homoeoteleuton and homoeoptoton also occur together without anaphora in the similar sentence (fr. 277) "hiantis video, ridentis non audio," and in the verse (fr. 170),

> tela dextra vibrant, russa sagula emicant,....

Further examples of each of these figures are very abundant. A rather simple instance of homoeoteleuton is provided by (fr. 180), "domo exeo, intro, et pedes corrigiis compedio," as well as by (fr. 292), "noctilucam tollo, ad focum fero, inflo, anima Reviviscit."[359] As additional examples one may cite fragments 265, "quocirca oportet bonum civem legibus parere, deos colere, in patellam dare μικρὸν χρέας," and 266, "non male dicere, pedem in focum non imponere, sacrificari," as well as (fr. 283), "altera exorat patrem libram ocellatorum, altera vinem semodium margaritarum," and the verse (fr. 223),

> toga tractata est et abolla data est,....

XUM

The figure homoeoptoton also appears frequently, and is best seen in examples such as (fr. 264), "lex neque innocenti propter simultatem obstrigillat, neque nocenti propter amicitiam ignoscit," or (fr. 241), "neque in bonum segete nullum est spicum nequam, neque in mala non aliquod bonum," to which should be added fragment 190, "sed simul manibus trahere lanam, nec non simul oculis observare ollam pultis, ne aduratur." The first of these examples is also an instance of the figure isocolon, as are the phrases (fr. 64) "sociis es hostis, hostibus socius...," and (fr. 298) "...terra non cepit et caelum recepit."[360] Further, all of these passages express contrasts producing the figure antithesis, which is complemented and emphasized by the isocolon. Antithesis is additionally visible in the many contrasts drawn between past and present, such as (fr. 497), "ubi tum comitia habebant, ibi nunc fit mercatus," and (fr. 159) "quod tunc quaestus tricinus erat, nunc est uber."

Equally important devices are chiasmus and paronomasia which occur at least as often as the figures mentioned above. The use of chiasmus varies from the simple (and onomatopoeic) fragment 3, "mugit bovis, ovi' balat...," to the obviously contrived (fr. 469), "Diogenem postea pallium solum habuisse et habere Ulixem meram tunicam...," in which the chiasmus emphasizes the comparison, and also includes the excellent example provided by the first line of the verses (fr. 356):

> Pacvi discipulus discor, porro is fuit Enni,
> Enniu' Musarum: Pompilius clueor.[361]

Etymological devices also are evident in the work of Varro, a fact which is not surprising in view of the author's fondness for postulating the sources of words, as seen in the de Lingua Latina.[362] Most obvious, of course, are the actual explanations of terms such as (fr. 420; cited by Oltramare, p. 101), apellatur a caelatura caelum, graece ab ornatu κόσμος, latine a puritia mundus," and (fr. 179; cf. Buecheler, p. 276 "etymologiae Varronis"), "quid? tu non vides in vineis, quod tria pala habeant, tripales dici?." These and similar explanations may have offered amusement or have been accepted with seriousness by Varro's readers. The actual effect is impossible to determine because of the fragmentary state of the satires themselves. In addition to such word explanations Varro also is fond of using the figure *adnominatio* or *paronomasia* (see footnote 310 above), as he does in the wordplay (fr. 268), "nec natus est nec morietur, viget veget ut pote plurimum," as well as in fragment 262,""lecto strato matellam, lucernam ceteras res esui usuique prae se portant." Other examples are provided by (fr. 298), "quem idcirco terra non cepit et caelum recepit," and the complicated (fr. 335), "...si belli homunculi conlecti sunt, si electus locus, si tempus lectum, si apparatus non neglectus."[363] Further, the type of device generally differentiated from *adnominatio* through the use of the term "figura etymologica" also appears in, for instance, fragment 359, " iurgare coepit dicens:

> 'quae scis atque in vulgum vulgas artemque
> expromis inertem.'"[364]

One additional type of wordplay which should be mentioned is *antimetabole* or *commutatio* which is defined by tee *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xxviii. 39) as "...cum duae sententiae inter se discrepantes ex transiectione ita efferuntur ut a priore posterior contraria priori proficiscatur..." (cf. Quintilian, IX, iii. 85). In Varro's satire entitled *Bimarcus* appears the sentence (fr. 64) "sociis es *hostis*, hostibus socius, bellum ita geris ut bella omnia domum auferas," which is an obvious example of this figure.[365] Another possible instance of *antimetabole* is fragment 241, "neque in bona segete nullum est spicum nequam, neque in mala non aliquod bonum." The

XUM

resemblance of this figure to antithesis (on which see the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xv. 21) is obvious.

The use of all of these figures by Varro indicates the rhetorical nature of his style, and possibly that of Menippus, although one cannot assume that Varro transfered figures line by line,but only that he may have observed certain figures used by Menippus and employed them himself because of his own understanding of rhetoric or because of desire to imitate in general the style of Menippus. In the area of choice of themes Varro also must be allowed some freedom and must be assumed to have taken over some themes completely from the Cynic,but also to have adapted certain themes to suit the tastes of his Roman audience,and to have included others, based on his own observations, which were congenial in spirit with the Cynic genre in which he was writing. Several themes which seem to have a Cynic origin already have been mentioned within this discussion of Varro (see above at footnotes 349, 350, 352, 353 ff.) and include criticism of superstition, greed, morals, and other philosophical schools, specifically the Stoic, Academic, and Epicurean. An additional Cynic theme is the ridicule of concern for one's burial (see above at footnote 131) which appears in the following fragment of Varro's *Cycnus* or *Peri Taphes* (fr. 81; cf. Oltramare, p. 105):

> quare Heraclides Ponticos plus sapit, qui praecepit ut comburerent, quam Democritus, qui ut in melle servarent. quem si vulgus secutus esset, peream si centum denariis calicem mulsi emere possemus.

Fear concerning the underworld is also mocked by Varro in the *Taphe Menippou*, when he comments (fr. 539; listed by Oltramare, p. 105, cf. his theme 91a on p. 64), "saltem infernus tenebrio, κακὸς δαίμων, atque habeat homines

XUM

sollicitos, quod eum peius formidant quam fullo ululam." Further, to those themes concerning superstition which have been noted previously should be added fragment 558,

> illud vero quodam meae
> ut ego non metuam fulmen, non haruspicem
> tristem, simul ac dici non quaero.[366]

The satire *Flaxtabula* furnishes another theme drawn from the Cynics, for fragment 177 informs the reader, "nec *dolorem* αδιάφορον esse, quod philosophia commalaxarem ea πάθη, neque irato mihi habenas dedi umquam, neque cupiditati non imposui frenos," refering to the Cynic concept indifference (cf. Teles, 49.5).[367] Also not lacking is the theme dealing with medicine which implies that philosophy is the real healer. Varro's *Quinquatrus* asks (fr. 440),

> quid medico mist opus? nempe tuo? absinthium ut
> bibam gravem
> et castoreum levemque robur,

and later adds (fr. 447), "tu medicum te audes dicere, cum in eborato lecto ac purpureo peristromo cubare videas aegrotum et eius prius alvum quam τύλην subducere malis?" This last fragment also, of course, hints at the disadvantages of wealth[368] and may in that sense be connected with other fragments concerned with the simple life (such as fr. 311-321). One final Cynic theme which deserves mention is the glorification of Heracles as a moral hero (cf. Oltramare, p. 55, Theme 51a; Ragnar Höistad, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, dissertation Uppsala, 1948, passim). Within Varro's works are four satires concerning Heracles, the *Hercules Socraticus*, the *Columna Herculis*, the *Hercules Tuam Fidem*, and Ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς, but the fragments do not allow one to draw many conclusions about their content, although one reference to the Ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς observes (fr. 20), "Varro in hac Menippea] cum de invicto Hercule loqueretur, eundem esse ac Martem probavit," a theme which sounds more Roman than Cynic. Other references are concerned primarily with the hero's labors (fr. 70) or his athletic ability (76, 162) and do not provide evidence of any philosophical use of Hercules as an example.

In addition to these decidedly Cynic themes there appear others which, while based on similar philosophical tenets, have been adjusted and modernized, i.e., Romanized, to suit the tastes and needs of Varro's contemporaries. Perhaps the most obvious examples of such a change are Varro's satires concerning superstition. The *Eumenides*, for instance, is directed against the orgiastic foreign religions then becoming popular at Rome (cf. Oltramare, p. 108), with special emphasis on the antics of the priests of the Magna Mater. Further, another work, the *Pseudulus Apollo*, seems to be directed against Serapis, as probably also was the comment (fr. 456), "recte purgatum scito, quom videbis Romae in foro ante lanienas pueros pila expulsim ludere."[369] These satires, while undoubtedly inspired by the author's own disgust, do reflect Cynic themes concerning superstition and especially the theme which Oltramare describes as (theme 93, p. 65, cf. p. 108), "*Les temples et les objets du culte* ne méritent aucun respect particulier."[370] Varro also modernizes the Cynic themes concerning the simple life and wealth by placing them within Roman contexts. For example, warnings against gluttony and overindulgence in wine (Oltramare, p. 50, Themes 31-31 f.) are given Roman settings in fragment 529, "φιλαναλῶται edones Romam, ut turba incendant annonam, et propter phagones ficedulum pinguem aut turdum nisi volantem non video," and fragment 530, "aliquot Romae sunt qui cellas vinarias fructuis causa fecerunt."[371] The comments dealing with excessive luxury in dress (fr. 212, 229, 311, 313) as well as with the use of perfume (fr. 480, "nunc emunt trossuli nardo nitidi vulgo Attici talento ecum.") and the expensive ornamentation of houses (fr. 182, 212, 531-534) are also cases in which Varro has adjusted Cynic themes to suit his own time.[372] Perhaps also to be included here are those satires in which the author, as Oltramare (p. 107) observes "...opposaient la vie saine, calme, heureuse du paysan à l'agitation des avides citadins...," and which include the *Peri philargyrias*, the *Manius*, and the *Serranus* (Oltramare, p. 107, who, however, gives examples only from the *Serranus* and the *Sexagesis*). The *Manius*, for example, stresses the fact that the countryman (fr. 250),

> dulcem aquam bibat salubrem et flebile esitet cepe,

a theme in keeping with the Cynic exhortation to abstain from wine and eat simply (Oltramare, p. 50, themes 31 and 31e; cf. Teles, p. 7.5). Within this same satire Varro adds what must be considered an exhortation attuned to the Roman sense of *pietas*, not dependent on any Cynic theme, when he urges (fr. 265), "quocirca oportet bonum civem legibus parere, deos colere, in patellam dare μικρὸν κρέας, as well as (fr. 266), "non male dicire, pedem in focum non imponere, sacrificari," an obvious contrast to his views on foreign superstition.

Additional themes appear which, like fragments 265 and 266, seem totally Roman and have only their polemic or facetious tone in common with Cynicism. The author, for instance, in his *Kosmotoryne* expresses his feelings against civil war when he writes of (fr. 225; noted by Oltramare, p. 108),

> Africa terribilis, contra concurrere civis
> *civi* atque Aeneae misceri sanguine sanguen,

and reveals some of its horror in his verses (fr. 222),

propter cunam capulum positum
nutrix tradit pollictori.

Somewhat akin to these sentiments is Varro's comment on slave revolt, probably referring to that of Spartacus, in which the author asks (fr. 193), "utrum oculi mihi caecuttiunt, an ego vidi servos in armis contra dominos?"[373] In his apparent acceptance of slavery Varro is far from the Cynic concept of doing without slaves (cf. Oltramare, Themes 40-4a, p. 52), although the idea of a revolt also would have been opposed by Cynics as a violation of detached tranquillity (cf. Theme 72b, p. 50 and p. 108, n. 2), especially since slavery was not necessarily an evil in their view (cf. Oltramare, Theme 18, p. 47) provided that one retained his peace of mind (cf. Theme 11, p. 45). An additional Roman theme, connected, in fact, with this last one concerning slavery, is that found in fragment 513 where the author observes, "crede mihi, plures dominos servi comederunt quam canes. quod si Actaeon occupasset et ipse prius suos canes comedisset, non nugas saltatoribus in theatro fieret." Oltramare (p. 108) views this passage as an example of Varro's horror at "le spectacle des luttes sociales...," but it is possible that this section has a less deadly theme. E. Norden, in his In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae (Leipzig, 1891), p. 325, n. 3), for instance, comments that the theme of this whole satire, the Synephebus, is obscure but that in fragment 514, "...servi de fuga deliberantes inducuntur, quo in argumento multi erant mimi...," and that fragment 513 "ad eandem rem pertinet...." Perhaps the Synephebus, then, is based on a theme from comedy, which he ridicules, or on some aspect of slavery concerning which the author brings in comedy as an example.[374] Varro's alleged dislike of certain aspects of the Roman theater seems to be recorded in his scornful remark (fr. 353) "ut comici cinaedici scaenatici," and in the comment by Augustine in *de civitate Dei* (IV, 1, ed. Emanuel Hoffmann, I, Leipzig, 1899, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*) that Varro "...cum rerum humanarum adque divinarum dispertitos faceret libros, alios humanis, alios divinis pro sua cuiusque rei dignitate distribuens non saltem in rebus humanis, sed in rebus divinis ludos scaenicos poneret, cum utique, si tantummodo boni et honesti homines in civitate essent, nec in rebus humanis ludi scaenici esse debuissent." Augustine's comment is intended against drama, but one cannot be certain that Varro's original statement also took that stand.[375] Such an attitude, fragment 353 notwithstanding, would be strange on the part of an author whose works include *de scaenicis originibus lib. III*, *de actionibus scaenicis lib V*, *de actis scaenicis lib. III*, *de personis lib. III*, *de comoediis plautinis*, and *Quaestionum plautinarum lib. V.*[376] Further, the following verses concerning Roman tragedians are not uncomplimentary (fr. 356):

> Pacvi discipulus dicor, porro is fuit *Enni*,
> *Enniu*' Musarum: Pompilius clueor.

Perhaps Varro was critical of inartistic comedy or music or perhaps he disliked the vulgar mime or was opposed to some themes, found in drama, which he thought might have a harmful effect on the populace. It is dangerous, however, to extrapolate too much from fragments such as these. Whatever may have been his opinions concerning the theater, Varro's references to the theater and to other Roman institutions and problems are important for this study chiefly because they show how a Cynic genre and Cynic themes could be adapted to fit the problems of a race and time different from those in which the genre and themes originated. The possible influence of the Roman satirists Ennius and Lucilius on Varro, especially in his choice of

XUM

meters and Romanization of themes, cannot be ignored, but has been ably discussed elsewhere.[377] After Varro, the genre of the Menippean satire finds its continuation in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis, in Petronius' Satyricon, in Lucian's Dialogues, and in Boethius' Philosophiae Consolatio, all of which works are beyond the chronological scope of this study.[378]

F. The Stoics and the Diatribe: Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and Panaetius

Up to this point the discussion of the history of the diatribe has been concerned almost entirely with the Cynics and their influence. Before tracing any farther the line of development extending from that school, one must consider the use of the genre by the Stoics, who, as Diogenes Laertius has noted in his description of Cynicism (VI, 104) and as is obvious from a comparison of doctrines, were rather closely related to the Cynics,[379] being founded of course, by a former Cynic, Zeno of Citium, whose use of the diatribe genre has been discussed above (see at footnotes 71, 72 and following discussion). The fact that the Cynicism and Stoicism eventually became critical of each other (on which see D. R. Dudley, A History of Cynicism, pp. 102-103) does not prevent the two schools from making use of the same genre and of many of the same ethical themes. Unfortunately the early Stoic diatribe tradition is represented by even fewer fragments than is the Cynic, and, therefore, as the following paragraphs will show, is largely a matter of conjecture based on slender evidence.

Evidence for the use of the term διατριβή as a title by the Stoics is late and consists of the testimony of Diogenes Laertius and Sextus Empiricus. The reference found in Sextus Empiricus to the diatribes of Zeno has been listed above (see at footnotes 71 and 72). Diogenes Laertius mentions diatribes by Persaeus (SVF, I, fr. 435), Cleanthes (SVF, I, fr. 481), Ariston of Chios (SVF, I, fr. 333, see above at footnote 166), and Sphaerus (SVF, I, fr. 620). Unfortunately,no fragments of these works with the exception of that of Zeno, have survived to bear witness to their form and content and to allow one to compare them with the works of the Cynics. One verse fragment, however, generally believed to be derived from Cleanthes, is preserved by Gregory of Nazianzus (*Carmina*, lib. I, 2, 10, 604-611)[380] and reveals a style which would have been congenial to the diatribal form. This fragment reads as follows:

> κἀκεῖνο δ᾽ οἷον; Στωϊκῶν τῶν φιλτάτων
> ὡς ἄλλος ἄλλῳ σαρκίῳ τις προσλαλῶν·
> τί σοι χρεωστῶ, φησίν, ἄθλιον δέρος;
> φαγεῖν; μέγιστον ἄρτος ἐνδεῶς δοθείς
> πιεῖν; ὕσωρ σοι δώσομεν καὶ ὀξίνην.
> οὐ ταῦτά μ᾽ αἰτεῖς, τὰ τρυφῆς δὲ καὶ κόρου
> κρυσταλλίνων τε ἁβρότητ᾽ ἐκπωμάτων.
> λίαν ἑτοίμως δώσομέν γ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ ἀγχόνην.

In their complaint against luxury demanded by the flesh these lines employ rhetorical questions in a fashion resembling the figure *ratiocinatio* (which is defined in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xvi. 23 as "...per quam ipsi a nobis rationem poscimus quare quidque dicamus...) and remind one of Bion's famous *prosopopoiia* of *Penia* (Teles, p. 6-7) in which such questions abound and in which the theme is somewhat similar. The simple nature of the style is obvious, as are the polemic tone and the use of *spoudaiogeloion* in the last line,which, in its surprising use of ἀγχόνην, is reminiscent of the dark

XUM

humor occurring in the following lines from Crates (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 86; cf. VI, 24):

> ἔρωτα παύει λιμός, εἰ δὲ μή, χρόνος·
> ἐὰν δὲ τούτοις μὴ δύνῃ χρῆσθαι, βρόχος.

Thus, while the lines cannot be assigned to a diatribe by Cleanthes, they at least reveal a kinship of tone and style with that genre.

Evidence for the method of presentation used for the diatribes by Cleanthes and other Stoics is scanty, although Ariston is mentioned (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 161) as, "...τις πειστικὸς καὶ ὄχλῳ πεποιημένος...," when he spoke in the Cynosarges, and Zeno is mentioned as giving lectures (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 5-11 and 174; see footnote 69 above). None of these references mentions diatribes, but evidence exists which indicates that at least some Stoics took up the methods of the Cynics, although one cannot ascertain whether any of the famous Stoics are included in this group. Panaetius, for example, according to the *De officiis* of Cicero (I, 128), censured the Cynics and those Stoics who were almost Cynics for their use of explicit language in referring to actions which could be considered obscene (see below at footnote 391 ff. and G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 84), and thus seems to provide evidence for the use of the Cynic diatribal style by certain Stoics. Further evidence may be found in one of Cicero's letters (*Ad fam*. XV, 19, 1), which, in contrasting the "rustici Stoici" with the Epicurean Catius who employed the Attic style, seems to imply, as A. Oltramare (p. 127) has observed, the existence of "diatribistes vulgarisateurs." Horace's poetry adds to the slight information concerning Stoic preaching, for in *Sermones*, II, iii. 31-35, Damasippus, a former art dealer, about to expound upon a Stoic theme, says,

> ... o bone, ne te
> frustrere; insanis et tu stultique prope omnes,
> siquid Stertinus veri crepat, unde ego mira
> descripsi docilis praecepta haec, tempore quo me
> solatus iussit sapientem pascere barbam
> atque a Fabricio non tristem ponte reverti.
> nam male re gesta cum vellem mittere operto
> me capite in flumen, dexter stetit et 'cave faxis
> te quicquam indignum. pudor' inquit' te malus angit,
> insanos qui inter vereare insanus haberi.'[381]

Concerning this passage G. C. Fiske, in his *Lucilius and Horace* (Wisconsin, 1920; p. 387) observes that this satire is intended partly to depict "...the various types of human folly engendered by the passions..." and partly "...to ridicule the exaggerated manner of the Stoic street preachers in attacking these passions." The particular Stoic preacher ridiculed in the satire seems not only to have delivered such speeches but also to have written extensively on the system of Chrysippus (220 books; cf. scholia to this *Sermo* in *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora*, ed. O. Keller, vol. II, Leipzig, 1904, rep. 1967; Oltramare, op cit., p. 128, and note 3). Horace's remarks concerning the Stoics are not limited to the *Sermones*, however, for in his *Epodes* (VIII, 15; cf. Oltramare, p. 127) the poet gives some information concerning the audience with whom these philosophers were popular, as he writes,

> quid, quod libelli Stoici inter Sericos
> iacere pulvillos amant:
> inlitterati num minus nervi rigent
> minusve lanquet fascinum?

The *libelli* seem to have been popularized writings, perhaps diatribes or something similar to them, and, in Oltramare's view (p. 127), their being mentioned in this context indicates that the Stoic influence extended "... non seulement chez les esclaves on dans la petite bourgeoisie, mais jusque dans le demi-monde débauché...." One must be cautious, however, in assuming

XUM

that Horace's remark, expressed as a reason for scorn can be taken at its face value when it may represent only a topos used by the author to express his bad opinion of the style of these works. To the references from Cicero and Horace just mentioned should be added Juvenal's biting comment (II, 19), possibly referring to similar Stoic preachers (cf. II, 65),

> ...sed peiores, qui talia verbis
> Herculis invadunt et de virtute locuti
> clunem agitant.[382]

Juvenal's remark, of course, is considerably later than the period under consideration in this study and is directed against fake philosophers who do not follow their own doctrines. Another late reference is that, found in Tacitus (Hist., 3, 81, ed. E. Koestermann, Leipzig, 1961), to the Stoic Musonius who is mentioned as addressing the troops of Vitellius and Vespasian concerning peace.[383] The work of the philosopher, large segments of which are preserved in Stobaeus (cf. A. C. van Geytenbeek, Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe, tr. B. L. Hijmans, rev. ed., Assen, Netherlands, 1962, p. 9), shows a close affinity with the diatribes of Bion and Teles (cf. T. Burgess, Epideictic Literature, Studies in Classical Philology, III, Chicago, 1902; p. 237, and Stobaeus, Anthologium, ed. O. Hense, rep. 1958; III, p. 748 and IV, p. 497) and indicates that this later Stoic at least (and others after him; cf. Burgess, ibid.) followed the Cynic diatribal tradition, which probably had become a Cynic-Stoic tradition long before. Once again, however, it must be emphasized that all of the references which have been cited here, with the exception of Panaetius, refer to the stoic diatribe at Rome and cannot be used as proof that any early Greek Stoics, such as Cleanthes and Chrysippus, followed the same methods, although it is likely that they did.

Conspicuously absent from the listing of Stoic diatribe writers given above is Chrysippus, who is credited with no diatribes in the list of writings preserved by Diogenes Laertius (SVF, II, fr. 13-18) and who also cannot be proved to have delivered such exhortations.[384] The style of this philosopher should be assumed to conform with that described by Quintilian (X, i. 84; SVF, II, 25) as typically Stoic, as he comments "minus indulsere eloquentiae Stoici veteres, sed cum honesta suaserunt, tum in colligendo probandoque quae instituerant plurimum valuerunt, rebus tamen acuti magis quam, id quod sane non adfectaverunt, oratione magnifici." Evidence from Fronto (*Epist.*, *ad* M. *Antoninum* *de* *eloquentia*; SVF, II, 27), however, seems to indicate that Chrysippus at least approved of a rhetorically polished style, if he indeed did not use it himself. Fronto writes "ubi illud acumen tuum? ubi subtilitas? Evigila et attende, quid cupiat ipse Chrysippus. Num contentus est docere, rem ostendere, definire, explorare? non est contentus: verum auget in quantum potest, exaggerat, praemunit, iterat, differt, recurrit, interrogat, describit, dividit, personas fingit, orationem suam alii accomodat: ταῦτα δ᾽ ἐστὶν αὔξειν, διασκευάζειν, ἐξεργάζεσθαι, πάλιν λέγειν, ἐπαναφέρειν, παράπτειν, προσωποποιεῖν." While this reference is late, it does serve to cast some doubt on the commonly accepted view of the Stoics given form by Cicero when he observes that (*De* *finibus*, IV, iii.7; SVF, II, 288) "quamquam scripsit artem rhetoricam Cleanthes, Chrysippus etiam; sed sic ut siquis obmutescere concupierit, nihil aliud legere debeat," and complains of Stoics in general that "pungunt quasi aculeis interrogatiunculus angustis, quibus etiam qui assentiuntur nihil commutantur animo et idem abeunt, qui venerant," (cf. *Paradoxa* *Stoicorum*, *Prooemium*, 2).[345] The differing opinions of Cicero and Fronto must be credited to differences of taste and

XUM

purpose and cannot be resolved entirely because of the lack of a complete work of Chrysippus by which his style could be judged. One reference from Plutarch, however, can be adduced in support of Fronto's remarks. In the *De Stoicorum repugnantiis* (1047b; SVF, II, 298) Plutarch indicates that Chrysippus had at least some interest in style for "πάλιν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ βιβλίῳ περὶ τῆς τῶν φωνηέντων συγκρούσεως ὑπειπών ' οὐ μόνον, φησί, ταῦτα παρετέον τοῦ βελτίονος ἐχομένους, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποιὰς ἀσαφείας καὶ ἐλλείψεις καί, νὴ Δία, σολοικισμούς, ἐφ' οἷς ἄλλαι ἂν αἰσχυνθείησαν οὐκ ὀλίγοι.'"[386] While none of this references provides any information concerning Chrysippus' possible use of the diatribe, the comments of Fronto and Plutarch at least show that Chrysippus would have been concerned with employing an effective, and therefore perhaps rhetorically ornamented, style to convey his views to his audience.

One might expect to find further evidence concerning Chrysippus and the diatribe in the *De ira* of Philodemus, a diatribe or at least a treatise written in the diatribal style which has Chrysippus' Περὶ παθῶν as one of its sources (see above at footnote 284). A study of the parallels drawn by Wilke (pp. xxxiv - xlviii and passim in the apparatus to the text of the *de Ira*, Leipzig, 1914) between surviving fragments of the Stoic's *Peri pathon* and sections of the Epicurean work show little evidence for the use of the diatribe style by Chrysippus. Only one fragment (SVF, III, fr. 478, p. 129. 26 ff), which is quoted above in footnote 284 and which seems to be the model for column XIII, 11-17 of the *de Ira*, shows what could be termed *spoudaiogeloion*, although it may have been intended as a serious description, and in addition makes use of alliteration, homoeoteleuton, and isocolon to convey its vivid description. Other fragments for which parallels cannot be found in the *de Ira* reveal Chrysippus' tendency to illustrate or support his views through the use of poetic quotations from Homer and Euripides. For example, Galen says concerning one section of the Περὶ παθῶν(SVF, III, fr. 473, p. 124.15), "ἡ δέ γε Μήδεια βιασθεῖσα πρὸς τοῦ θυμοῦ, περὶ ἧς καὶ αὐτῆς οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ὁ Χρύσιππος οὐκ αἰσθάνεται καθ' ἑαυτοῦ τῶν Εὐριπίδου μεμνημένος ἐπῶν· (Eur. Med. 1078.1079)

καὶ μανθάνω μέν, οἷα δρᾶν μέλλω κακά,
Θυμὸς δὲ κρείσσων τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων."[387]

Galen is also the source for an example of Chrysippus' use of Homer, for he records the following passage concerning grief from the *Peri pathon* (SVF, III, fr. 467):

> Περὶ δὲ τῆς λύπης καὶ ὡς ἂν ἐμπλησθέντες τινὲς ὁμοίως φαίνονται ἀφίστασθαι, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀχιλλέως ταῦτα λέγει ὁ ποιητὴς πενθοῦντος τὸν Πάτροκλον· (δ 541. Ω 514)
>
> Ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κλαίων τε κυλινδόμενος τ' ἐκορέσθη,
> καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ' ἵμερος ἠδ' ἀπὸ γυίων,
>
> επὶ τὸ παρακαλεῖν ὥρμησε τὸν Πρίαμον, τὴν τῆς λύπης ἀλογίαν αὐτῷ παριστάς.

Chrysippus' use of these two lines is quite interesting, since he has taken the first from the *Odyssey*, making a change from first to third person in the verb and substituting "Ἀλλ' ὅτε" for "αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ," thereby applying the words to Achilles rather than to Odysseus after he heard of the murder of Agamemnon, while the second line is taken from the *Iliad* in the section concerning Priam's visit to Achilles. The change in wording seems too slight to be an actual parody,[388] a figure which Quintilian (VI, iii, 97)

XUM

describes as "...ficti notis versibus similes...," but the purpose and the result must be similar to that achieved by parody, especially since one can assume that Chrysippus' readers would have been well-acquainted with the Homeric originals and would have realized that the author has condensed two episodes of grief into one, perhaps for reasons of emphasis. In addition to these quotations Chrysippus also seems to have used references to famous passages. Fragment 473, for instance, also from Galen (SVF, III, p. 123.33 ff.) records the story, attributed by the Stoic to Euripides, in which Menelaos, approaching Helen to kill her, "...ἰδὼν δὲ καὶ καταπλαγεὶς εἰς τὸ κάλλος ἐξέβαλε τὴν μάχαιραν, οὐδὲ ταύτης ἔτι δυνάμενος κρατεῖν, καθὰ καὶ ἡ ἐπίπληξις αὕτη εἴρηκεν αὐτῷ· (Eur. Andr. 629.630)." While quotations and references such as these which have been mentioned are a popular device and are commonly found in the diatribe, they are by no means limited to that genre,[389] and, therefore, in the absence of any other major diatribal traits, cannot be assumed to indicate the use of the form by Chrysippus. The Peri pathon itself, further, seems to have been a treatise concerning (SVF, III, fr. 456) the Stoic view of the [390] emotions and cannot be proven on the basis of the surviving fragments to have any kinship to the diatribe, such as the kinship seen in, for example, Philodemus' Peri kakion.

Just as there is no evidence to connect Chrysippus with the diatribal tradition, so also is evidence lacking concerning any diatribes by the later Stoics Diogenes of Babylon, Panaetius of Rhodes, and Posidonius of Apamea. Further, the rhetorical doctrines followed by Diogenes and his pupil Panaetius would seem totally to eliminate any use of the diatribe by them in the form in which it was employed by the Cynics. Diogenes, whose style was described as "modesta...et sobria" (SVF, III, fr. 8, p. 21;

cf. G. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C. - A.D. 300*, Princeton, 1972; p. 71), adhered to the concept that rhetoric was intended to teach, not to delight the hearer, although he is credited with developing or refining the Stoic theory of the five stylistic virtues, namely Ἑλληνισμός or correct Greek, σαφήνεια or clarity, συντομία or brevity, πρέπον or suitability, and κατασκευή or "avoidance of the vulgar."[391] A philosopher employing such a style and stressing the virtues listed probably would not have approved of the diatribe with its many popular devices, intended to teach by delighting the listener. In the work of his student Panaetius, whose theories on style are recorded in Cicero's *de Officiis*, are found not only an adherence to the theories of Diogenes but also an attack against certain practices common in Cynic literature.[392] Panaetius especially stressed the principle of τὸ πρέπον (cf. Fiske, p. 85), which Cicero defines in *De officiis* (I, 27; van Straaten, fr. 107) by commenting "sequitur ut de una reliqua parte honestatis dicendum sit, in qua verecundia et quasi quidem ornatus vitae, temperantia et modestia omnisque sedatio perturbationum animi et rerum modus cernitur. hoc loco continetur id, quod dici latine decorum potest, graece enim πρέπον dicitur [decorum]." Following this principle Panaetius directs his attack, as recorded by Cicero (*De officiis*, I, 128) against the Cynics or "...si qui fuere Stoici paene Cynici...," whose concept of παρρησία or free speech (see footnote 37 above) allowed them to call "...actions involving moral obliquity or social impropriety... by their real names..." (Fiske, p. 84). The Stoic philosopher saw the use of such explicit language as an offense not only against *to prepon* but also against nature, since (Fiske, pp. 84-85; *de Officiis*, I, 128), "nos autem naturam sequamur et ab omni quod ob oculorum auriumque approbatione abhorret fugiamus." As a further expression of his point of view Panaetius, according to Cicero's account, held the view *De officiis*,I, 128) that "latrocinari, fraudare, adulterare re turpe est, sed dicitur non obscene; liberis dare operam re honestum est, nomine obscenum." This Stoic, then, would have censured, as unbecoming, various sayings of Diogenes of Sinope (perhaps such as those found in Diogenes Laertius, VI, 37-38 and 46 if the language in them were more explicit than the compiler records it) and of Bion, who, according to Diogenes Laertius (IV, 52), "ἦν δὲ καὶ θεατρικὸς καὶ πολὺς ἐν τῷ γελοίως διαφορῆσαι, φορτικοῖς ονόμασι κατὰ τῶν πραγμάτων χρώμενος."[393] Further, he also must have disapproved of Chrysippus' *Peri ton archaion physiologon* in which, according to Diogenes Laertius (VII, 187-188), the author tells the story of Zeus and Hera "αἰσχρῶς" and "...εἰ καὶ ἐπαινεῖ ὡς φυσικήν, χαμαιτύπαις μᾶλλον πρέπουσαν ἢ θεοῖς, ἔτι τ᾽οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς περὶ πινάκων γράψασι κατακεχωρισμένην·...." If the report of Diogenes is correct, for it sounds rather like gossip created by an opponent of the Stoics, then Chrysippus may have been one of the Stoics mentioned by Panaetius as "almost Cynics," although it seems unlikely that the famous logician would belong in such a group which probably, however, did include Ariston of Chios (see above at footnote 154) and Apollodorus of Seleucia (cf. D. R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism*, p. 103).

In addition to objections concerning obscenity is found concern for "propriety of speech" (Fiske, p. 85) which is directed towards stylistic rather than strictly moral considerations. One finds, for instance, the comment (*De officiis*, I, 148; Fiske, p. 85), "quibus in rebus duo maxime sunt effugienda, ne quid effeminatum aut molle et ne quid durum aut rusticum sit." Panaetius probably would have applied his strictures also to the use of words which were inappropriate not because they were obscene but because they were new creations which made the style seem harsh or effeminate. For instance, he would have avoided "...ὑπερβαίνειν τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔθος ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν," which Zeno is alleged to have done (SVF, I, 33; Fiske, p. 85 and note 68 on harshness), apparently causing sufficient criticism to prompt Chrysippus to write a Περὶ τοῦ κυρίως κεχρῆσθαι Ζήνωνα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 122). Cicero's complaint in *De finibus*, IV, 7 (ed. Th. Schiche, Teubner, 1969) that Stoic orators, apparently following the views of Cleanthes and Chrysippus, "...verba fingunt, deserunt usitata,""reflects this point of view (see below at footnote 385). Similar complaints probably would have been leveled by Panaetius against the Cynic diatribe which, of course, was concerned more with attracting and pleasing an audience than with maintaining a pure diction (cf. E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, I, Leipzig, 1909; p. 130 on "die saloppe Diktion..." of the diatribes of Bion).

Panaetius, further, was concerned in his views of style primarily with the *sermo* or conversation as opposed to the *contentio* or argument intended for public consumption (Grant, p. 132; cf. *De Officiis*, I, 132 for definitions), and in connection with the *sermo* is found this Stoic's view of wit, a natural connection since humor is often a part of familiar conversation (cf. Grant, p. 136 and *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, III, xiii. 23). Humor suitable for the conversational style would not be the biting sort employed by Diogenes of Sinope but rather the irony favored by Socrates and to some extent by Bion (see Fiske, pp. 86 and 181). Further, *spoudaiogeloion* need not be banished but rather has a definite part to play (Fiske, p. 88; *De officiis*, I, 134; Grant, p. 136). Panaetius, then, could have approved of diatribes which maintained the character of the *sermo* and employed *spoudoiogeloion* as gentle irony and not as a vicious attack. The polemic tone, however, and other "excesses," in his view, would have kept the Cynic diatribe from fulfilling Panaetius' requirements for the good style.

These opinions of Panaetius have been mentioned only to show that his view of rhetoric and style should have kept him from writing, delivering, or even considering as worth hearing, anything which resembled the Cynic diatribe as it has been described in this study. Indeed, there is no evidence to show that Diogenes of Babylon, Panaetius, or his pupil Posidonius ever wrote any diatribes,[394] and, while admittedly an argument from silence, this fact, combined with the opinions mentioned, seems to remove these three from further consideration in this study of the diatribe. If some of Panaetius' objections, however, are directed against the style of his Stoic predecessors Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, as well as others, then perhaps one can assume that the diatribe genre as developed by the Cynics also was used by those early Stoics.

G. Horace: Sermones, II, 3

Further, although none of the early diatribes or popularized works of the Stoics have survived,one can obtain some indication of the nature of the Stoic diatribe in the first century B.C. from the admittedly exaggerated sample included by Horace in *Sermones*, II, iii, which, despite the fact that it is in poetry and bears the mark of Horatian artistry, does have a resemblance in form and content to the Bionian diatribe. Horace frames this diatribe, allegedly the work of the Stoic Stertinus (see above at footnote 381), with a dialogue between himself and Damasippus, a former art dealer who takes it upon himself to pass on to Horace the "wisdom" which he has acquired by listening to the Stoic preacher and who,therefore,delivers to his friend the speech which he heard from Stertinus. The speaker has chosen for his topic the Stoic paradox (cf. Cicero, Paradoxa Stoicorum, IV) "...omnes homines insanos,"[395] which he defines as follows (Serm., II, iii, 43-46):

> quem mala stultitia et quemcumque inscitia veri
> caecum agit, insanum Chrysippi porticus et grex
> autumat. haec populos, haec magnos formula reges,
> excepto sapiente, tenet.

In expounding upon this topic Stertinus, as represented by Damasippus, employs a real medley of anecdotes, poetic references, humorous comparisons, and multiple rhetorical questions which can be appreciated best if one examines the devices in the order in which they appear in the Horatian satire, along with the themes which they attempt to convey.

The whole satire can be divided, as it is by Lejay (p. 387), into sections dealing with the madness associated with greed (82-157), ambition (158-223), luxury (224-280), which includes extravagance in goods and in love affairs, and superstition (281-295). In fact the Stoic himself makes this division (cf. Lejay, p. 387) when he urges (77-82),

> audire atque togam iubeo conponere, quisquis
> ambitione mala aut argenti pallet amore,
> quisquis luxuria tristive superstitione
> aut alio mentis morbo calet: huc propius me,
> dum doceo insanire omnis vos, ordine adite.

Prior to this exhortation Stertinus has begun his diatribe with a direct approach (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, I, iv, 6-7), necessary in this case, of course, to prevent the suicide of Damasippus, by giving the despondent fellow the warning quoted above at footnote 381 and then making him disposed to listen through the promise (41-42);

> primum nam inquiram, quid sit furere: hoc si erit in te
> solo, nil verbi, pereas quin fortiter, addam.[396]

There follows then the definition of the paradox involved (see above at footnote 394) which, in its statement that the definition applies to kings and nations, seems intended to emphasize the importance and general nature of the topic in order to retain the attention of Damasippus. This beginning seems to be an example of the use of advice found in rhetorical handbooks which inform the orator (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, I, iv.7; cf. Cicero, *De inventione*, I, xvi. 23) "adtentos habebimus, si pollicebimur nos de rebus magnis, novis, inusitatis verba facturos, aut de iis quae ad rem publicam pertineant, aut ad eos ipsos qui audient, aut ad deorum immortalium religionum....". In his placement of the definition itself, further, Stertinus is complying with the standard practice of "preachers" from his school who, as G. C. Fiske (p. 388) notes, began "...formal discourses with exact definition of their terms..." (cf. footnote 451 below). The poet Horace, then, seems to be building up his mock diatribe by carefully following the standard practices of the group whom he wishes to ridicule, thereby making his criticisms more telling in their accuracy.

After he has defined his topic, Stertinus continues to assure himself of Damasippus' attention before progressing into the division and discussion of the ramifications of his topic. A vivid simile (48-52) concerning the wanderings of two men who deviate from the path in a forest and are both lost, but in different areas, is presented as an analogy to the situation of Damasippus and accompanied by the comment (53)

> qui te deridet, caudam trahat....,

a crude proverb, calculated to draw attention through familiarity with the practice (concerning which see Lejay, p. 399) and through the brevity with which it is expressed. The use of an empirical argument such as this (cf. Fiske, p. 388) which depends on recognition of the analogy to make its point

XUM

is naturally a form of argument which is more suitable for the diatribe and its purposes than is the more complex method of the Stoic propositional syllogism, and probably represents the actual use of this form of argumentation on the part of Stoic preachers who realized that cogent logic alone could not retain the average audience.[397] Following this analogy Stertinus develops a contrast between the fool who fears when there is nothing to fear (53-55) and the reckless fool who rushes through fire and water (56-57) although (57-59)

> clamet amica
> mater, honesta soror cum cognatis, pater, uxor:
> 'hic fossa est ingens, hic rupes maxima: serva!'

Dialogue, asyndeton, isocolon, and anaphora combine to enliven this passage which quickly leads into the story of the actor Fufius who fell asleep in the midst of a performance and did not hear his cue, even when the audience apparently joined in the shouting, an obvious, but hardly strict, analogy to the story concerning the reckless fool, and apparently intended to inject a note of humor into the diatribe. Perhaps Horace has made the connection purposely loose to ridicule the speaker's willingness to add a story anywhere just to command attention or to seem to prove a point which he really does not prove.

Stertinus next seizes upon the attention of his listener by the potent device of inserting him within the speech. Thus the Stoic asks (64-65),

> insanit veteres statuas Damasippus emendo:
> integer est mentis Damasippi creditor?...,

a question which is followed by a series of rhetorical questions such as those common in the diatribal style, to which are added terse statements forming a mock dialogue with Damasippus' creditor, who must eventually find that he cannot collect his money from the man who has borrowed from him and who like

Proteus can escape from any attempt at collection (66-73).[398] After this reasoning by question and example (cf. Lejay, p. 360) Stertinus concludes his introduction, which actually seems long enough not only to have gained the attention of Damasippus but also to have convinced him, at least partially, of the truth of the Stoic's thesis, with (74-76)

> si male rem gerere insani est, contra bene sani:
> putidius multo cerebrum est, mihi credi, Perelli
> dictantis, quod tu numquam rescribere possis.

These follows then the division of the argument (77-81) which has already been quoted above and which is noteworthy for its use of emphatic word placement, hysteron proteron (cf. Lejay, p. 404), anaphora, and homoeoptoton.

Stertinus next attacks greed, the first and possibly worst, form of madness, and builds his case on a series of examples and characterizations which feature a large amount of spoudoiogeloion and which seem intended to overwhelm the listener with "proof." The first of these examples is an anecdote concerning one Staberius who required in his will that his heirs should carve on his tomb the amount of his estate or else be compelled to provide a huge feast, hyperbolically described as (87) "frumenti quantum metit Africa...," and gladiators for the people (84-86). The question (89-90),

> . . . quid ergo
> sensit, cum summam patrimoni insculpere saxo
> heredes voluit?...,

which probably is merely a rhetorical one, although Stertinus seems to be assigning the thought to some imaginary interlocutor or to his actual audience, namely Damasippus,[399] then produces the following sketch of the character of Staberius (91-94):

> . . . quoad vixit, credidit ingens
> pauperiem vitium et cavit nihil acrius, ut, si
> forte minus locuples uno quadrante perisset,
> ipse videretur sibi nequior. 'omnis enim res,
> virtus, fama, decus, divina humanaque pulchris

> divitiis parent; quas qui construxerit, ille
> clarus erit, fortis, iustus.' ...,

in which the asyndeton serves to stress the twisted system of values of the miser who also (98-99)

> . . . hoc veluti virtute paratum
> speravit magnae laudi fore.

The moralizing continues as the Stoic preacher relates, in the form of a rhetorical question, a contrasting anecdote dealing with the Greek Aristippus[400] (cf. Lejay, p. 374), who, when he was in the middle of Libya, ordered his slaves to throw away his gold since its weight made them travel more slowly (99-102). After the query (102), "...uter est insanior horum?," and the maxim (103), "nil agit exemplum, litem quod lite resolvit," Stertinus groups together for ridicule the man who buys and hoards lyres which he does not play, the man who hoards knives and shoemaker's lasts, although he is not a cobbler, and the man who collects sails even though he is "adversus mercaturis ....". The speaker observes that all of these are rightly said to be out of their minds (107-108) and then asks the question (108-110), which connects these characterizations with the remarks in his next section,

> ...qui discrepat istis,
> qui nummos aurumque recondit, nescius uti
> conpositis metuensque velut contingere sacrum?

Concerning this section dealing with the hoarding of lyres and other things Lejay (p. 359) states that Stertinus "...donne une forme conditionnelle à son raisonnement (104-130)...," and that "le raisonnement n' a ni la rigueur ni la raideur de l'argumentation technique, et cela se comprend. Mais le procédé est identique." Lejay, further, seems to assume (p. 358) that the use of the conditional form of argumentation is the factor which distinguishes Stoic logic from its predecessor, Aristotelian categorical logic, and that

XUM

the conditional form used here by Stertinus reflects his background as a Stoic.[401] The use of conditionals, however, is not limited to Stoic logic, and, further, the important distinction between Stoic and Aristotelian logic is the use of propositions as variables by the former and the use of classes or categories as variables within the syllogism by the latter.[402] One might add here also that the enthymeme, which Aristotle calls a "ῥητορικὸν συλλογισμόν" (*Ars Rhetorica*, ed. A. Roemer, Leipzig, 1885; I, 1356 b5) sometimes has a conditional form, such as (Ibid., 1397a11), "εἰ γὰρ ὁ πόλεμος αἴτιος τῶν παρόντων κακῶν, μετὰ τῆς εἰρήνης δεῖ ἐπανορθώσασθαι," and therefore must be taken into account as one ancestor of the rhetorical styles of argument found in ancient treatises such as Cicero's *De inventione* (I, xxxiv ff) and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (II, xviii. 28), although, of course, Stoic influence also undoubtedly was felt.[403] The argumentation in this section of Horace's satire (104-130), then, cannot be assumed to represent Stoic influence or to show that "the technique of the Stoic dialectic is therefore observed by Horace" (Fiske, p. 388), merely because the statements involved are couched in a conditional form. One, rather, must consider the arguments as a series of rhetorical ones which may reflect the Stoic style, since they are composed of propositions, but which cannot be separated from the rhetorical tradition, known to Horace as well as to his Stoic character. A brief analysis will reveal the structure of the propositions involved.

The first of these arguments is that which records the action of the three hoarders described above and then, after declaring that these fellows are rightly said to be mad, asks how they differ from the man who hoards silver and gold. The basic meaning here can be reduced through induction to

XUM

the premise "if men hoard things which they cannot use, then they rightly are considered mad," to which one could add a second premise "men hoard things which they cannot use," and a conclusion, "therefore, they are mad," thereby producing a scheme similar to the Stoic mood (i.e. "outline (σχῆμα) of an argument),"if the first, then the second. The first. Therefore, the second."[404] The fact that the second premise and the conclusion easily can be supplied make it possible that this section forms an argument by itself and is actually an enthymeme,which is a type of reasoning in which premises which are obvious and can be supplied by the listener may be omitted by the speaker.[405] This type of argumentation seems especially useful for the diatribe since, as Aristotle comments (Ars Rhetorica, II, 1395b 24-31, ed. A. Roemer, Teubner, 1885) concerning the enthymeme, "οὔτε γὰρ πόρωθεν οὔτε πάντα δεῖ λαμβάνοντας συνάγειν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀσαφὲς διὰ τὸ μῆκος, τὸ δὲ ἀδολεσχία διὰ τὸ φανερὰ λέγειν. τοῦτο γὰρ αἴτιον καὶ τοῦ πιθανωτέρους εἶναι τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους τῶν πεπαιδευμένων ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις, ὥσπερ φασὶν οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους παρ᾽ ὄχλῳ μουσικωτέρους λέγειν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὰ κοινὰ καὶ καθόλου λέγουσιν, οἱ δ᾽ ἐξ ὧν ἴσασι, καὶ τὰ ἐγγυς ...." The rest of the section concerning hoarders (108-128) is then a rhetorical amplification of the point established by the enthymeme and serves as additional proof of the speaker's contention. Stertinus makes his transition from the enthymeme into the amplification with a rhetorical question and then procedes (111-114) with a description or characterization of a miser who keeps watch stretched out beside a huge pile of grain and does not dare (113-114)

> ...esuriens dominus contingere granum
> ac potius foliis parcus vescatur amaris.

Added to this folly is the madness of hoarding good wine and drinking vinegar and the insanity of lying on straw while good covering "...putrescat in arca"

(115-119). The Stoic notes (120-121), however, using the disease imagery common in the diatribe,

> nimirum insanus paucis videatur, eo quod
> maxima pars hominum morbo iactatur eodem...,

and then explodes into a series of rhetorical questions, notable for a tone that is both polemic and facetious, which is most evident in the final two questions (126-128), which ask (creating emphasis through the asyndeton),

> . . . quare,
> si quidvis satis est, peiuras, surripis, aufers
> undique? tun sanus?

The change from narrative to direct address is effective in creating emotion and, along with the vivid description, helps to create the illusion that the speaker's point has been proven in a logical fashion (cf. Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, II, 1401b, on the effects of alleged proof by exaggeration), when actually it only has been illustrated.

The next section (128-141) is not directly concerned with greed, but seems to fit into the discussion of that topic, because the force of the preceding rhetorical section continues into this passage. Following the statement, formulated as a direct address to the audience, that if one begins to strike with stones other people or the slaves one has bought, then all the boys and girls would shout that one was mad, the Stoic asks (131-133)

> cum laqueo uxorem interimis matremque veneno,
> incolumi capite es? quid enim? neque tu hoc facis Argis
> nec ferro ut demens genetricem occidis Orestes.

The connection between this section and that concerning the miser seems to be one of contrast, but a weaker contrast than that used to link the episodes dealing with Staberius and Aristippus. Throwing stones at slaves injures valuable property,[406] an action in opposition to the protective hoarding done by the miser, who seems to injure only himself. This thought with its implication of violence toward property and other people then provides an opportunity for the speaker to insert his comments on murder, which amount to a digression from the main topic of greed. Lejay (p. 411) observes concerning this section that it "n' exprime pas l'opinion publique, puisquil s agit de crimes secrets; le raisonnement est *a fortiori*: 'Tout le monde dira que tu es fou si tu assommes tes esclaves, et tu croiras être sain d'esprit loroque tu etrangleras ta femme?'" What appears here, then, if one follows Lejay, is a rather strange instance of reasoning which groups together the injuring of slaves and other people by throwing stones and the murdering of one's wife and mother, and asks whether, if one is considered mad for doing the former, he is sane when he does the latter, an illogical *non sequitur* which need not be accidental. Stertinus, after all, is being very facetious, especially with his comment about Argos, and can expect the force of his rhetoric to carry his audience over the logical hurdle and on to the interpretation of Orestes' conduct which follows and which seems to present a rationalization of the Orestes' myth (see above at footnote 346 and below at footnote 414; cf. Kiessling-Heinze, p. 237) with the statement that Orestes was not mad after he killed his mother for (139-141)

> non Pyladen ferro violare aususve sororem
> Electran, tantum maledicit utrique vocando
> hanc Furiam, hunc aliud, iussit quod splendida bilis.

Whether this passage is meant to represent the actual technique of a speaker such as Stertinus or whether it exaggerates in order to ridicule the moralist who uses any pretext to slip in another point is difficult to determine, since the passage is coherent, if a bit hyperbolic and dramatic in comparison to the simple examples which precede it.

XUM

After the digression concerning Orestes, Stertinus concludes the section on avarice with a story (142-157) concerning Opimius,[407] a miser whose refusal to spend enough for proper nourishment has brought on a condition of lethargy (145-147),

> ut heres
> iam circum loculos et clavis laetus ovansque
> curreret.

The faithful physician of Opimius then, attempting to stir him from his condition, has a table set up on which bags of coins are poured out and orders many to come and count the money. In the lively section of dialogue which follows this action, the doctor tries, to no avail, to convince Opimius that he must eat, but the miser, refusing to spend the money for even a little rice broth, exclaims (156-157)

> eheu,
> quid refert, morbo an furtis pereamque rapinis?

The use of such anecdotes employing dialogue is a standard device of the diatribe (cf. Teles, pp. 12.8-13.10) and is also a common rhetorical figure (cf. sermocinatio in Rhetorica ad Herennium. IV, lii.65) which here serves the purpose of variety after the narrative sections concerning avarice.

Having completed his remarks on greed Stertinus brings in an imaginary interlocutor who helps provide transition from the topic of avarice to that of ambition, as the following question and answer interchange by interlocutor and Stoic shows (158-160):

> quisnam igitur sanus? qui non stultus. quid avarus?
> stultus et insanus. quid, siquis non sit avarus,
> continuo sanus? minime. cur, Stoice? dicam.[408]

This passage resembles the figure ratiocinatio which "...est per quam ipsi a nobis rationem poscimus quare quidque dicamus, et crebro nosmet a nobis petimus unius cuiusque propositionis explanationem..." (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xvi.23), but is not as fully developed as that figure generally is and, in view of the usual style of the diatribe, probably is intended as a mock dialogue. In replying to the interlocutor's question Stertinus brings in an example from medicine, perhaps following a diatribal tradition (see above at footnote 300 and following) or perhaps using a type of analogy common among the Stoic philosophers (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 239 on Chrysippus; Fiske, p. 389 on sin as morbus).[409] This particular analogy is easily understood and requires no knowledge of philosophy but only common sense. Stertinus through his analogy observes that just as a person who does not have a stomach disease may be ill otherwise, so also one who is not a "...periurus neque sordidus..." (164) still may be "ambitiosus et audax..." (165) and therefore needs treatment (166, "naviget Anticyram.") for insanity (cf. Kiessling-Heinze, p. 230 on hellebore and Anticyra). As the conclusion of his analogy the Stoic poses the rhetorical question (166-167),

> ...quid enim differt, barathrone
> dones quidquid habes an numquam utare paratis?,

a query which sounds like a maxim connecting the follies of extravagance and greed as equal manifestations of insanity.[410] This whole section from the mock dialogue (158-160) through the medical analogy (161-164) to the concluding question is a prime example of the power of rhetoric to persuade by simulating a logical argument. While the medical analogy actually proves nothing concerning sanity, the average listener who sees the point of the analogy will be carried along by the speed of the parataxis and short sentences that follow and on into the rhetorical question, which then seems like the conclusion of a careful argument, and will be as convinced as if the insanity of the ambitious man actually had been demonstrated.

This rhetorical "proof" is supported immediately by Stertinus' usual method, the insertion of a story (168-186) which employs a situation with which the audience easily can identify and which is presented as an actual occurrence.[411] The Stoic depicts one Servius Oppidius of Canusium who, when he is dying, calls to his bed his two sons, between whom he has divided his two estates, and delivers an exhortation to them (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 240 on the "paränese" of Oppidius), composed of last advice and instructions but resembling a diatribe in its tone and rhetorical devices.[412] Following disclosure of his concern that one son might become a spendthrift and the other a miser, on the basis of their present habits (171-175), Oppidius urges his sons (177-179),

> tu cave ne minuas, tu ne maius facias id
> quod satis esse putat pater et natura coercet...,

making use of anaphora, homoeoteleuton, isocolon, and chiasmus to emphasize his point. For Oppidius, however, worse than greed or extravagance is ambition, and he, therefore, as he says, binds his sons by an oath which demands that whichever of them should become an aedile or a praetor,"... is intestabilis et sacer esto..." (cf. Lejay, p. 419; Kiessling and Heinze, p. 242 on these terms). There follows then a bitter denunciation of the activities of a man who squanders his money in pursuit of power which in tone rivals the scorn of a Cynic such as Diogenes and which is couched as an ironic question (182-186), asking

> in cicere atque faba bona tu perdasque lupinis,
> latus ut in circo spatiere aut aeneus ut stes,
> nudus agris, nudus nummis, insane, paternis;
> scilicet ut plausus quos fert Agrippa feras tu,
> astuta ingenuum volpes imitata leonem?[413]

With no transition, except for that provided by the continuation of the theme of the madness of ambition, the Stoic inserts a passage of dialogue between Agamemnon and an interlocutor, presumably Stertinus himself, which concerns the king's refusal to allow the burial of Ajax. Stertinus opens the dialogue with the question (187)

> nequis humasse velit Aiacem, Atrida, vetas cur?,

to which Agamemnon replies (188),

> rex sum.

These opening lines seem to be based on the discussion, found in Sophocles Ajax (1047 ff.; in *Sophoclis Fabulae*, ed. A. C. Pearson, Oxford, rep. 1967), between Menelaos and Teucer concerning the burial of Ajax. Menelaos declares (1047-1048; cf. Lejay, p. 420),

> οὗτος, σὲ φωνῶ τόνδε τὸν νεκρὸν χεροῖν
> μὴ συγκομίζειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐᾶν ὅπως ἔχει.

Objecting Teucer asks (1049),

> τίνος χάριν τοσόνδ᾽ ἀνήλωσας λόγον; ,

to which Menelaos replies (1050),

> δοκοῦντ᾽ ἐμοί, δοκοῦντα δ᾽ ὃς κραίνει στρατοῦ.

Whether Horace modelled the dialogue attributed to Stertinus on Sophocles' work or on the work of a Roman playwright which was based on Sophocles is difficult to determine. Pacuvius wrote a play entitled *Armorum Iudicium*, probably based on Aeschylus' Ὅπλων κρίσις (see E. H. Warmington, ed, *Remains of Old Latin*, II, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass., 1961; p. 172), from which the following lines, apparently dealing with the burial of Ajax, are preserved (Warmington, op. cit., p. 178; fr. 46; cf. Lejay, p. 420 on Pacuvius):

(A) Pro imperio agendum est. (B) Quis vetat quin adtolat?

Further, Accius also wrote an Armorum Iudicium (cf. Lejay, p. 420) dealing with the same incidents and including the following lines which may have been spoken by Ulysses (Warmington, fr. 127-130, p. 368) and which feature Agamemnon, perhaps in imitation of a later scene in Sophocles' Ajax where Ulysses and Agamemnon discuss the situation (1318 ff.):

> ...Cur vetera tam ex alto appetissis
> discidia, Agamemno?
> noxitudo...
> oblitteretur Pelopidarum ac per nos sanctescat genus.[414]

The fact that Accius' work probably was based on Euripides and Sophocles (Warmington, pp. 358-359) makes him the likely intermediary, although one cannot be certain that Horace himself did not combine the two scenes from Sophocles or even from his Latin source, since the style and meter of this passage show that the poet cannot be quoting either Accius or Pacuvius directly, and therefore could have changed content as well as form to suit his own purposes. An additional, and quite likely possibility, is that noted by Kiessling and Heinze (p. 244), who comment "auch hier mag H. wohl eine ähnlich rhetorisch zugespitzte Ausführung eines älteren Kynikers oder Stoikers vor Augen schweben wie 132 fg.....". It is also possible that the Ajax story was a common topic for exercises in the rhetorical schools, although with a somewhat different emphasis. In the Rhetorica ad Herennium (I, xi.18), for instance, one finds the following example of a conjectural issue:

> Coniecturalis est cum de facto controversia est, hoc modo: Aiax in silva, postquam resciit quae fecisset per insaniam, gladio incubuit. Ulixes intervenit, occisum conspicatur, corpore telum cruentum educit. Teucer intervenit, fratrem occisum, inimicum fratris cum gladio cruento videt. Capitis arcessit. Hic coniectura verum quaeritur. De facto erit controversia; ex eo constitutio causae coniecturalis nominatur.

This same incident is used also to illustrate the five-part argument or epicheireme (II, xix.28; cf. Cicero, de Inventione, I, xlix.92).[415] Although these examples concentrate on Ulysses, they do indicate that the story was well-known and increase the possibility that the proper legend of Ajax served also as a topos. Further, the sacrifice of Iphigenia by Agamemnon seems to have become a standard theme at some time, for Seneca the elder uses the story as the topic of this third Suasoria.[416] Thus, Horace had ample sources for the argument between Agamemnon and Stertinus and could have made use of any or all of them to present an example which certainly was familiar to his audience. It is interesting to note, further, that if Horace combined the two scenes from Sophocles or from one of the Roman playwrights that he was employing the process of contaminatio (cf. Fiske, p. 50) which was used not only by the Roman dramatists but also apparently by the Stoic Chrysippus, who, as was demonstrated above (see above after footnote 387, on SVF, III, fr. 467), combined a quotation from the Odyssey with one from the Iliad in a section dealing with grief and featuring the meeting of Priam and Achilles after the death of Hector. If other Stoics can be shown to have used this method as well, then there would be further support for Kiessling and Heinza's hypothesis that Horace's model was a Cynic-Stoic rhetorical work.

Now that the possible sources for the Agamemnon-Stertinus debate have been discussed, one may consider the dialogue itself and its use within the diatribe. The use of rapid dialogue, changing from stichomythia to slightly longer speeches, first of all, obviously serves the purpose of providing variety. The Stoic has been using many narrative examples, often, to be sure, enlivened by dialogue, but to avoid boring his audience he must change to something that is vivid and at the same time pleasing in its familiarity. In other words

XUM

he is putting into practice "expolitio" which is defined by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xlii.54) as "...cum in eodem loco manemus et aliud atque aliud dicere videmur..." and which could involve the use of dialogues or "sermocinatio...in qua constituetur alicuius personae oratio adcommodata ad dignitatem..." (IV, xliii.55). Further, while variation and *expolitio* comprise the theory behind this use of dialogue, the practice itself stems directly from the diatribe with its fondness for poetic quotations used as examples (see above at footnotes 93 and 94; cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 244).

The choice of myth cannot be proved to be a part of the diatribe tradition, although Antisthenes did write a speech entitled Αἴας ἢ Αἴαντος λόγος.[417] The substitution of Agamemnon for Menelaos as the antagonist, however, whether due to some diatribe tradition or to the poet's choice, provides an excellent example of the ambitious man who will let nothing stand in his way, a position which could not be held by Menelaos as convincingly as by his more powerful and traditionally stubborn brother. Thus, Stertinus conducts his dialogue with Agamemnon rather than with Memelaos, and begins with the lines quoted above which resemble those spoken by Teucer and Menelaos in the Sophoclean play. Following this beginning and Stertinus' remark (188),

> 'nil ultra quaero plebeius'...,

which is antithetical to the first remark of Agamemon,[418] the king insists that he himself is just, but gives the Stoic an opportunity to voice his criticism when he adds (189-190),

> '...ac sicui videor non iustus, inulto
> dicere quod sentit permitto.'

Stertinus, replying with the wish that Agamemnon may take Troy and lead home his fleet, then asks (192)

> ergo consulere et mox respondere licebit?...,

XUM

and is given permission to do so. The section which follows is a good example of the figure *licentia* which is defined by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xxxni.48) as "...cum apud eos quos aut vereri aut metuere debemus tamen aliquid pro iure nostro dicimus, quod eos aut quos ii diligunt aliquo in errato vere reprehendere videamur...." Thus, beginning with a rhetorical question the Stoic voices his criticism of the order to leave Ajax "..., heros ab Achille secundus,..." unburied[419] and asks, using obvious homoeoteleuton and alliteration (195-196),

> gaudeat ut populus Priami Priamusque inhumato,
> per quem tot iuvenes patrio caruere sepulchro?...,

a query which imitates the following passage from the *Iliad* (I, 255 ff.; cited by Lejay, p. 422 and Kiessling and Heinze, p. 245):

> ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
> ἄλλοι τε τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ,
> εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρναμένοιϊν,
> οἳ περὶ μὲν βουλὴν Δαναῶν, περὶ δ᾽ἐστὲ μάχεσθαι.

There seems to be a subtle facetiousness or sarcasm in Stertinus use of an imitation of this particular Homeric passage, which is found in the speech by Nestor when he tries to soothe Achilles and Agamemnon in their quarrel over Briseis, for Stertinus is reminding the king of one of his greatest mistakes at the same time as he is pointing out another error to Agamemnon. When the ruler quickly justifies himself with the statement (197-198),

> 'mille ovium insanus morti dedit, inclitum Ulixen
> et Menelaum una mecum se occidere clamans.'...,

the Stoic counters with the polemical question (199-201),

> tu cum pro vitula statuis dulcem Aulide natam
> ante aras spargisque mola caput, inprobe, salsa,
> rectum animi servas?...,

which implies the same madness as that depicted by Aeschylus (Agamemnon, 218-227, in Opera, ed. Denys Page, Oxford, 1972) in the following strophe:

ἐπεὶ δ᾽ἀνάγκας ἔδυ λέπαδνον
φρενὸς πνέων δυσσεβῆ τροπαίαν
ἄναγνον, ἀνίερον, τόθεν
τὸ παντότολμον φρονεῖν μετέγνω·
βροτοὺς θρασύνει γὰρ αἰσχρόμητις
τάλαινα παρακοπὰ πρωτοπήμων·
ἔτλα δ᾽οὖν θυτὴρ γενέσθαι
θυγατρός ,γυναικοποίνων
πολέμων ἀρωγὰν
καὶ προτέλεια ναῶν.

A contrast with the less destructive Ajax follows, which stresses the fact that Ajax did no harm to his wife and son or even to Teucer or Ulysses (201-204). Agamemnon's rejoinder, that he "prudens" placated the gods with blood

> ...ut haerentis adverso litore navis
> eriperem... (205-206)

is met by the Stoic with the query (207)

> nempe tuo, furiose?...,

which is ironic to the audience in light of the fact that Agamemnon released the fleet through the shedding of his daughter's blood, his own blood in the sense of kinship, and then literally paid with his own blood (although at the dramatic date of the dialogue this payment is in the future) when Clytemnestra slew him in revenge.

After Agamemnon's reply (207),

'meo, sed non furiosus.'...,

Stertinus delivers his argument to the contrary in a sixteen line speech which is notable as another example of a rhetorical proof which simulates logic. Beginning with the proposition (208-210),

qui species alias veris scelerisque tumultu
permixtas capiet, commotus habebitur atque
stultitiane erret nihilum distabit an ira...,

the Stoic, as Lejay (p. 425) observes, "...raisonne toujours en prenant l'opinion pour point de départ...," although, perhaps, one should say rather that Stertinus reasons from the probable and the acceptable point of view, which he may list as common opinion, as he does here through the use of "habebitur" (Lejay, p. 425; Fiske, p. 388), and which, of course, appeals to an audience concerned with the familiar and commonplace rather than with abstract proofs. This statement of a common opinion presents in elaborate form the simple proposition, "If one, seizing upon illusions that are false and thrown into confusion by the excitement of crime, errs through folly or through anger, he will be "considered crazed." In the statement and rhetorical question which follow (211-213) Stertinus applies this first proposition to a specific case which may be paraphrased as, "if Ajax kills innocent lambs and you (i.e. Agamemnon) commit a crime because of empty honors and have a heart that is puffed up, then both of you are considered crazed." Such a paraphrase admittedly changes some of the emphasis of the actual words of Stertinus who states (211)

Aiax inmeritos cum occidit desipit agnos:...,

and then asks (212-213),

cum prudens scelus ob titulos admittis inanis,
stas animo et purum est vitio tibi cum tumidum est cor?...,

but is intended here to show only the underlying meaning of Stertinus' words and to illustrate more clearly the connection of his query with the expression of common opinion. Neither of these propositions proves the other, but the uncritical listener, because of the apparent connection of the two statements, may think that a proof has been developed. There follows then the example of a man who treats his pet lamb as a daughter, even going so far as to plan for a husband for it, and thus (217-218).

> ...interdicto huic omne adimat ius
> praetor et ad sanos abeat tutela propinquos.[420]

Obviously this "hypothetical example" (cf. Fiske, p. 388) is intended to support the Stoic's first proposition which contends that people consider a man crazed whether he errs through mere folly or through anger, but the story itself actually has no connect with the story of Ajax and Agamemnon, although the choice of a lamb as a pet animal seems to be intended to simulate a connection. The Stoic concludes his arguments with what can be considered a series of enthymemes (cf. Lejay, p. 360; Kiessling and Heinze, p. 249), although each statement only elaborates on the one preceeding it. The first of these enthymemes is the question and answer (219-220),

> quid, siquis gnatam pro muta devovet agna,
> integer est animi? ne dixeris....,

which represents the speaker's attempt to tie in his "hypothetical example" with the actions of Agamemnon, an obviously forced parallel. One can convert this enthymeme into a complete syllogism which then would state, "if a man devotes his daughter to death like a lamb, he is not sane. A man (i.e. Agamemnon) devotes his to death like a lamb. Therefore, he is not sane," the minor premise and the conclusion being omitted here by the speaker as obvious.

XUM

Following this enthymeme appears a second one (Lejay, p. 360) which, apparently drawing upon the preceeding one and on the hypothetical example for its proof, thus justifying the "ergo" (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 249), and at the same time providing confirmation for the first enthymeme, states (220-221),

> ...ergo ubi prava
> stultitia, hic summa est insania;...,

which again depends on common sense to complete it and which is followed by (221),

> ...qui sceleratus,
> et furiosus erit;...,

a statement offering a good example of expolitio (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xlii.54), in which the speaker makes the same point in a different way. The fourth enthymeme (cf. Lejay, p. 360) also is nothing except elaboration (and expolitio), couched in the grand style in contrast to the other expressions of the same thought, as the following lines indicate (222-223):

> ...quem cepit vitrea fama
> hunc circumtonit gaudens Bellona cruentis.

One noticeable feature of the last three enthymemes, in addition to the use of expolitio, is the fact that each of them can stand alone as a maxim, a characteristic which is not surprising,since maxims are closely related to enthymemes and may be used to form them, as Aristotle observed in his Ars Rhetorica (II, 21, 1394b17 ff.). Further, the use of such phrases and of the repetition involved at the end of Stertinus' argument obviously is intended to emphasize and impress forcefully on the audience the insanity of ambition. Through these enthymemes and the story of the mad man and his lamb the Stoic leaves his audience with the impression that he has proved his point, when actually, as has been noted in other cases above, Stertinus attempts (and probably suceeds in his efforts) to convince his listener or listeners through truisms and a hypothetical example which only persuade, but cannot stand up as real proof when submitted to close scrutiny.[421] It is probable that such rhetorical proofs represent the actual methods of a street preacher such as Stertinus, but one also must take into account the fact that Horace is parodying a diatribe and therefore may be presenting an exaggerated example of a loose rhetorical argument, although even an exaggeration must retain sufficient characteristics of the original form to be convincing.

In addition to its value as an example of the use of poetic quotations and of rhetorical arguments in a diatribe from the time of Horace, Stertinus' exchange with Agamemnon presents a scene which must have been common in the diatribe, that of the sage fearlessly confronting a powerful ruler.[422] The topic itself is not limited to the diatribe, of course, appearing also, for example in Solon's answers to Croesus, recorded by Herodotus (I, 30 ff.), but the topic as part of the diatribal tradition must go back at least to anecdotes concerning Diogenes of Sinope, who, according to Diogenes Laertius (VI, 60), when Alexander the Great "...ἐπιστάντος αὐτῷ καὶ εἰπόντος, 'ἐγώ εἰμι Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς,'..., replied "'κἀγώ...Διογένης ὁ κύων.'...," obviously unimpressed by mere power. Further, the common themes, described by Oltramare (p. 58) as "le sage est *tout* *puissant*...," "le sage a la vraie *gloire* et la vraie *noblesse*...," and "le sage est *utile* *a* *autrui*...," must be considered illustrated by the sage's (or would-be sage's) encounter with a king such as Agamemnon.

With this confrontation ends Stertinus' comments on ambition and begins the section on extravagance or *luxuria* (cf. Lejay, p. 387), which also deals with common diatribal themes (cf. Oltramare, pp. 49-52). Stertinus indicates the change of topic with the imperative (224).

> Nunc age luxuriam et Nomentanum arripe mecum...,

and then entices his listener with the promise (225),

> vincet enim stultos ratio insanire nepotes.[423]

The next fifty-four lines are used to illustrate the folly of extravagance, harking back though the mentioning of Nomentanus (224), to the death-bed diatribe of Servius Oppidius and thus providing a connection between ambition and extravagance as equal types of insanity. Beginning his remarks, as usual, with a story, Stertinus tells of a young heir who, calling to himself (227-229)

> ...piscator uti, pomarius, auceps,
> unguentarius ac Tusci turba inpia vici,
> cum scurris fartor, cum Velabro omne macellum...,

declares, in a speech noteworthy for its antitheses, asyndeton, anaphora, and alliteration (234-238),

> 'in nive Lucana dormis ocreatus, ut aprum
> cenam ego; tu piscis hiberno ex aequore verris.
> segnis ego, indignus qui tantum possideam; aufer,
> sume tibi deciens; tibi tantundem; tibi triplex,
> unde uxor media currit de nocte vocata.'

This young man, of course, is meant to seem ridiculous, but, ironically enough, his actions, on the one hand, ally him with the Cynic doctrine urging men to eschew wealth and luxury (cf. Oltramare's topics, pp. 49-52) and, on the other hand, put him in conflict with the same philosophy since, in giving away money, he is corrupting the recipients (cf. Teles, p. 39.1-4 on the folly of giving "χρήματα" to one in need). Perhaps Stertinus did not subscribe to these views, but he certainly was against extravagance in any form, including the stupidity of throwing away wealth, a view which would have been especially acceptable to Damasippus, who had experienced the loss of money, and to other traditionally pragmatic Romans.

Two other brief examples follow this first one. Stertinus tells (239-241) how the wealthy son of the tragic actor Aesopus (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 251) took a pearl from the ear of Caecilia Metella (wife of P. Lentulus Spinther and mistress of Dolabella, cf. Lejay, p. 430) and dissolved it in vinegar so that "...deciens solidum absorberet...." When the Stoic asks in an exclamatory fashion (241-242),

> ...qui sanior ac si
> illud idem in rapidum flumen iaceretve cloacam?...,

the reader cannot help but compare the actions of the son of Aesopus with those of the first young man who has thrown away his patrimony in perhaps a less foolish way but who, in giving money to the dregs of the populace, has, in a figurative sense, cast his money into the sewer. The third example depicts a folly similar to that of the son of Aesopus, for the sons of Quintus Arrius, ironically referred to (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 252) as (243-244)

> ...par nobile fratrum
> nequitia et nugis pravorum et amore gemellum...,

were accustomed to lunch on expensive nightingales and thus, provoke the Stoic to ask, in what must be taken as an exasperated tone (246),

> quorsum abeant? sani ut creta, an carbone notati?...,

possibly referring to (Kiessling and Heinze, p. 252), "...den griechischen Gebrauch der ψῆφος λευκή und μέλαινα für Freispruch und Verurteilung mit unterlaüft." These last two examples obviously are made more effective through the use of people familiar to the audience as examples, since, just as is the case with the use of popular maxims (cf. Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, II, 21, 1395b1 ff.), an audience identifies with and remembers references which

XUM

have some connection with its everyday experiences and also likes the momentary feeling of superiority which comes when one hears someone else held up as an object of ridicule.

With these three examples, which are actually instances of the use of brief character sketches or χαρατηρισμοί common in the diatribe (see above at footnote 90) and notable for their *spoudaiogeloion*, the Stoic makes his point concerning extravagance with property under "normal" circumstances and then proceeds to his most polemical section in which he attacks extravagance of goods and affection in love affairs. G. C. Fiske (pp. 392 ff.) has shown many parallels between this section and the work of Horace's predecessor Lucilius, but one can assume that Lucilius in his turn owed much to the diatribal tradition and that, therefore, dependence on Lucilius does not remove this section from consideration as part of Stertinus' diatribe. Stertinus begins his attack on love with the proposition that if childish pastimes pleased a bearded man, then madness would agitate him (247-249), a thought which provides no transition from the preceeding section concerning extravagance unless one assumes that only a wealthy and prodigal man could afford to spend time in childish games. Appealing once again to reason, as he did in line 225, the Stoic equates love-sick behavior with childishness, when he asks (250-254),

> si puerilius his ratio esse evincet amare
> nec quicquam differre, utrumne in pulvere, trimus
> quale prius, ludas opus, an meretricis amore
> sollicitus plores: quaero, faciasne quod olim
> mutatus Polemon?

This rhetorical question leads into an anecdote (254-257) concerning Polemon who gave up his debauchery, along with the "insignia morbi," that is, his

> fasciolas, cubital, focalia...,

when he was persuaded by Xenocrates the Academic to turn to philosophy (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 253; Fiske, p. 392; Lejay, p. 432). Fiske (p. 392) observes concerning this anecdote that "now for the idea of interweaving such χρεῖαι in the texture of satire Horace had ample precedents in Lucilius...," but one must add that both poets also had "ample precedents" in the diatribal tradition, to which the many anecdotes "woven" into the fragments of Bion and Teles bear witness.

The example of Polemon is intended as a challenge to the listener to match the good conduct of the former libertine and, of course, must be taken as a hint that the audience should pay as much heed to Stertinus as Polemon did to Xenocrates, an implied comparison which is flattering to both Stertinus and Damasippus. The Stoic then offers as further enticement an analogy drawn between a stubborn child who will not accept an apple when it is offerred to him but wants it only if no one gives it to him and the (259-264)

> ...amator
> exclusus qui distat, agit ubi secum, eat an non,
> quo rediturus erat non arcessitus, et haeret
> invisis foribus? 'nec nunc, cum me vocet ultro,
> accedam? an potius mediter finire dolores?
> exclusit; revocat: redeam? non, si obsecret.'

The lover is answered by his wiser slave who observes (265-271),

> ...'o ere, quae res
> nec modum habet neque consilium, ratione modoque
> tractari non volt. in amore haec sunt mala, bellum,
> pax rursum: haec siquis tempestatis prope ritu
> mobilia et caeca fluitantia sorte laboret
> reddere certa sibi, nihilo plus explicet ac si
> insanire paret certa ratione modoque.'

For this exchange between lover and slave Horace has drawn on Terence's *Eunuchus* and has quoted and paraphrased the following lines (I, 46-49 and 56-63; in *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*, ed. Sidney G. Ashmore, Oxford, 2nd ed.,

XUM

1908, rep. 1962; cf. Lejay, pp. 434-435; Fiske, p. 393; Kiessling and Heinze, pp. 254-255) which are part of a conversation between the lover Phaedria, whom the courtesan Thais has shut out, and his slave Parmeno:

> PH. Quid igitur faciam? non eam ne nunc quidem
> quom accersor ultro? an potius ita me comparem,
> non perpeti meretricum contumelias?
> exclusit; revocat: redeam? non, si me obsecret.
> . . . .
> PA. proin tu, dum est tempus, etiam atque etiam cogita,
> ere: quae res in se neque consilium neque modum
> habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes.
> in amore haec omnia insunt vitia: iniuriae,
> suspiciones, inimicitiae, indutiae,
> bellum, pax rursum: incerta haec si tu postules
> ratione certa facere, nihilo plus agas
> quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias.

Horace and his character Stertinus could assume that some of the audience would recognize the Terentian play as the source for the dialogue represented in the dialogue and therefore supply the background of the story for themselves, a fact which indicates the value of taking examples from literature which, as the Rhetorica ad Herennium (IV, i.2) observes, "...testimoniorum locum obtinent. Id enim quod admonuerit et leviter fecerit praeceptio exemplo, sicut testimonio; conprobatur.".

In his use of this play as a source for an example Horace is true to the diatribal tradition not only because he has inserted within the speech of Stertinus a quotation from a poetic work, but also because he has taken his quotation from the Roman equivalent of Greek New Comedy, just as authors of diatribes seem to have drawn on Greek New Comedy for examples (cf. Fiske, pp. 393-394). A possible influence for Horace's choice of plays is Lucilius, who wrote a satire which contained "...a much freer working over of the same scene...," making him "...the first satiriest, following the precedent of the διατριβή to paraphrase a scene from the New Comedy as vivid means of moral teaching..." (Fiske, p. 394).[424] The difference in the treatments of Horace and Lucilius indicate that each used Terence independently and that, as Fiske observes (p. 394), "...Horace was influenced rather by the Lucilian convention of using a scene from the palliata than by a desire to reproduce closely the Lucilian adaptation of such a scene." Further, it is interesting to note that Cicero also made use of this same scene in his Tusculan Disputations (IV, xxxn.76; cf. Lejay, p. 435), quoting lines 59-63 in a polemical section concerning love. The fact that Lucilius, Cicero, and Horace all made use of the same Terentian passage in polemics against love indicates that all three recognized the suitability of the example from the Eunuchus for their topic, or that each was following the example of some existing polemic against love which made use of this passage, or finally, that Cicero and Horace both were influenced independently by Lucilius. In view of the fragmentary state of the remains of Lucilius' satire, however, one can only list these three possibilities and cannot state definitely that one of them is the solution.[425]

Of the three writers who quote this passage from the Eunuchus, only Cicero quotes directly, while Lucilius and Horace both make alterations. Horace's changes seem to have some importance, although one must be careful not to exaggerate that importance. In Phaedria's speech the major change is the emphasis, in Horace, on putting an end to the "dolores" of love, while the Terentian version mentions putting an end to the "meretricum contumelias," a more specific reference. This alteration is significant only in that the word "dolores" seems to agree with the concept of love as a form of insanity or as a disease which causes one pain, reflected in the "insignia morbi" of line 254 (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, pp. 251-252), and therefore is substituted for the idea of enduring the "mertricum contumelias." As G. C. Fiske has pointed out (p. 389) the use of *morbus* to refer to a misdeed is in keeping with Stoic terminology,[426] a fact which makes it probable that the term *dolores* is used by Horace with his Stoic preacher in mind. The specific connection between *amor* and *morbus*, however, cannot be limited to the Stoics and is, of course, a common theme in Greek and Latin poetry prior to Horace. Theocritus, for example, claims (XI, 1-3, in *Bucolici Graeci*, ed. A. S. F. Gow, Oxford, 1952, rep. 1966),

> Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
> Νικία, οὔτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, οὔτ' ἐπίπαστον,
> ἢ ταὶ Πιερίδες·...,

while Lucretius (IV, 1048 ff.) speaks of love as a wound and connects it with madness in the lines (IV, 1117-1120, ed. C. Bailey, Oxford, 3 vols., 1947, rep. 1963),

> inde redit rabies eadem et furor ille revisit,
> cum sibi quid cupiant ipsi contingere quaerunt,
> nec reperire malum id possunt quae machina vincat;
> usque adeo incerti tabescunt vulnere caeco.[427]

Other examples could be taken from the love elegies contemporary with Horace, and, indeed, one might assume that some criticism or ridicule of those works is intended by this section,[428] although the main purpose is an attack on the type of mad love which is contrary to the principles held by Horace's character Stertinus.

In addition to the change from "Contumelias" to "dolores" in Phaedria's speech other changes occur in the speech of the slave Parmeno. One interesting, but probably not especially significant alteration, is the change from Terence's "...eam consilio regere non potes..." (58) to Horace's (266-267)

> ...ratione modoque
> tractari non volt...,

which puts greater emphasis on the power of the force involved by stressing that a thing which has no "modum" or "consilium" does not itself wish to be managed. In the second half of line 267 Horace substitutes mala for Terence's vitia, a change necessitated by the meter and by the fact that war and peace and the fluctuations of love must be considered evils rather than faults.[429] The final lines (268-271) are a paraphrase of Terence with the addition of comments on the fickleness of the components of love, a thought implicit in the speech of Parmeno but embellished by Horace with the comparison to the fickleness of the weather. Viewed as a whole, the changes in the slave's remarks have a minimal effect on the meaning of the passage, but the style is altered, especially in the final sentence, and made more elaborate than the simple prose-like style of the Terentian speech. Perhaps Horace has tried to adapt the passage to the style of his Stoic orator or perhaps he has rewritten the speech to fit it into his own style and meter or to emulate the original, making changes to suit his own taste or to create a parody.

Immediately following the conclusion of the slave's speech Horace further connects the behavior of the lover with the behavior of a petulant child through the questions (272-275),

> quid? cum Picenis excerpens semina pomis
> gaudes, si cameram percusti forte, penes te es?
> quid? cum balba feris annoso verba palato,
> aedificante casas qui sanior?...,

in which the reference to a game with apple seeds (cf. Lejay, p. 433) played by the lover reminds one of the child and the apple of lines 258-259, while the ridicule of affected lisping further stresses the picture or χαραστηρισμόν of the lover as a child.[430] The facetious tone of these questions changes

XUM

to a stronger polemic tone in the next lines which leave the theme of childishness and turn to the dangerous phase of madness which drives the lover to violence. Beginning with the warning

> ...adde cruorem
> stultitiae atque ignem gladio scrutare. modo, inquam...,

which contains a reference to the Pythagorean proverb, "πῦρ μαχαίρᾳ μὴ σκαλεύειν,"[431] the Stoic brings in a contemporary example, the killing of Hellas by Marius whom she had spurned and who then committed suicide (Lejay, p. 436 and Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium vetustiora, ed. O. Keller, II, Teubner). Stertinus asks his audience concerning Marius (278-280),

> cerritus fuit? an commotae crimine mentis
> absolves hominem et sceleris damnabis eundem
> ex more inponens cognata vocabula rebus?

As Kiessling and Heinze have observed (pp. 257-258), Stertinus here is speaking as a lawyer would and, in concluding his discussion of love as madness, employs the "status causae definitionis ex rebus" (p. 258). A status or constitutio, the Latin equivalent of the "στάσις" of the Greek rhetorician Hermagoras, basically was "...the 'stand' taken as a result of the conflicting allegations of prosecutor and defendant, the 'set-up' of the case."[432] In this "case" the stand is one concerning definition or, as Cicero (de Inventione, I, viii.11) says of the constitutio definitiva, "nominis est controversia, cum de facto convenit et quaeritur, id quod factum est quo nomine appelletur." Stertinus, thus, admits the fact that Marius killed Hellas, but he questions the meanings of insania and scelus as applied to the action involved. Further, the Stoic seems to be accusing his listener or some imaginary adversary of inconsistency and quibbling over the meanings of the terms even though the results are equally criminal (cf. Lejay, p. 437; Kiessling and Heinze, p. 258 on "cognata").

XUM

After concluding his section on extravagance and love on a highly rhetorical note with this provocative question, which would have been recognized as a status by any listener trained in rhetoric, Stertinus plunges, without transition, into an attack on superstition. Two brief character sketches, enlivened by dialogue, and notable as examples of spoudaiogeloion, are the means employed by the Stoic to point out the insanity of the person shaken "...timore deorum..." (295). In the first sketch an elderly freedman, thirsty and with his hands washed (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 258), prays at the shrine of the Lares Compitales (Lejay, p. 438; Kiessling and Heinze, p. 258) and begs (282-284),

> ...'unum,'
> - 'quid tam magnum?' addens -, 'unum me surpite morti!
> dis etenim facile est'...,

a request which prompts Stertinus to comment that (284-286), although the old man was healthy as far as his ears and eyes were concerned,

> ...mentem, nisi litigiosus,
> exciperet dominus, cum venderet. hoc quoque volgus
> Chrysippus ponit fecunda in gente Meneni.[433]

Further, while Stertinus is stressing the folly of superstition, more than one diatribal theme is evident in his discussion. The old man, in his prayers shows not only a preoccupation with religion which often is ridiculed in diatribes (cf. Oltramare, pp. 64-65, themes 92, 92a, 93, and 94), but also a fear of death which is contrary to the teachings of the Cynic and Stoic preachers, who argue that death is not an evil (Oltramare, p. 48, theme 25a from Diogenes of Sinope in Stobaeus, IV, 29a, 19 ed. Hense). Thus, the χαρατηρισμός of the superstitious freedman enables the speaker to convey more than the concept of the madness inherent in superstition, even though that is his main theme.

The second example features a sketch of an even more foolish person, a mother whose child is ill with a fever and who prays to Jupiter promising him that (290-292),

> 'frigida si puerum quartana reliquerit, illo
> mane die, quo tu indicis ieiunia, nudus
> in Tiberi stabit.' ....

Although this prayer must leave the audience wondering how the boy has managed to survive as long as he has with such a mother, the Stoic emphasizes his point with the wry comment (292-295),

> ...casus medicusve levarit
> aegrum ex praecipiti: mater delira necabit
> in gelida fixum ripa febrimque reducet,
> quone mala mentem concussa? timore deorum...,

which includes a fine example of hysteron proteron (Kiessling and Heinze, p. 260) when the Stoic speaks of the mother killing the boy and bringing back his fever. In this example, as in the previous one, Stertinus stresses the foolishness of superstition and fear of the gods, stressing not only a common diatribal theme but also the common Stoic view that such fear is a πάθος which is a κίνησις ψυχῆς ἄλογος (Kiessling and Heinze, p. 261). The Stoic concept of the emotions need not be discussed here, but one must stress the fact that Stertinus here is condemning the supertitious and terrified attitude toward the gods which drives men to insane actions, but he is not condemning religion in general. The distinction is an important one, since the Stoic concept of the sage, who, indeed, is the only man recognized as sane (see lines 45-46 of the satire), insisted that wise men (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 119) "θεοσεβεῖς τε τοὺς σπουδαίους· ἐμπείρους γὰρ εἶναι τῶν περὶ θεοὺς νομίμων· εἶναί τε τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἐπιστήμην θεῶν θεραπείας. ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ θύσειν αὐτοὺς θεοῖς ἁγνούς θ' ὑπάρχειν· ἐκνεύειν γὰρ τὰ περὶ θεοὺς ἁμαρτήματα."[434] Further, one should note that the standard

XUM

diatribe themes concerning religion, with some exceptions, are directed against the fear induced by superstitious beliefs (Oltramare, p. 64, themes 92, 92a) or against silly practices involved with superstition (Oltramare, p. 65, themes 92c and 94; theme 93 is an exception to this view, but late as well).

With this attack on superstition Damasippus ends his recitation of the diatribe of Stertinus and resumes his dialogue with the poet Horace by announcing that (298-299)

> dixerit insanum qui me, totidem audiet atque
> respicere ignoto discet pendentia tergo...,

a vow which contains, in good diatribe fashion, a reference to the fable, also found in Catullus 18, 21, concerning the man who carries his own faults in a knapsack on this back and those of someone else in one slung in front of him (Lejay, p. 441). When Horace makes the mistake of asking Damasippus (301-302),

> qua me stultitia, quoniam non est genus unum,
> insanire putas? ego nam videor mihi sanus...,

the Stoic convert launches himself into a second diatribe which includes a reference to Agave carrying the head of Pentheus, an attack on Horace's pretensions in trying to imitate Maecenas (cf. Lejay, p. 442), and a fable concerning the mother frog who, in trying to find out from her surviving son the size of the calf who killed her other children, puffs herself up until the little frog comments (319-320),

> ...'non, si te ruperis,' inquit,
> 'par eris.'

Damasippus finally exasperates the poet's patience by telling him that if any one was sane when he wrote poetry then Horace is sane and then beginning to enumerate other faults until the poet only can exclaim (326), 'o maior tandem parcas, insane, minori.'

With this exclamation ends the satire and also the imitation of a Stoic diatribe. The above analysis at least demonstrates the varied nature of the genre and its use of rhetoric to persuade, if not convince, the audience.[433] Once again, of course, it must be stressed that Horace's presentation is a parody and thus probably contains exaggerations, especially in the number of examples used, although most of the devices can be found in equal numbers in the works of Teles. As G. C. Fiske has observed (p. 388), "...we have the regular linguistic marks of the διατριβή, such as asyndeton, the use of miniature illustrative scenes, frequent metaphors, brutal directness of language, and above all the effort to relieve the seriousness of the central argument by conscious lapses into the sermo plebeius."[436] One can assume, further, that Horace's diatribe represents the genre, as used by some Stoics of his time, with a reasonable degree of accuracy, since any parody must be easily recognizable to be effective. Whether the diatribe of Stertinus is at all similar to the diatribes of Zeno and other early Stoics or to those of Stoics contemporary with Panaetius, however, cannot be determined with certainty, although the remarks of Panaetius (see above after footnote 392) increase the likelihood that Stertinus' work does represent the commonly used form. The fact that Horace was indebted to Lucilius in sections of this satire does not alter the work's value as a representative of contemporary Stoic diatribes and may, in fact, enhance its value as a representative of the common Stoic diatribe, since Lucilius, a contemporary of Panaetius, was influenced by the diatribe of his time (cf. Fiske, pp. 397-398). Horace, therefore, can be seen as drawing material indirectly from the older diatribes familiar to Lucilius, as well as directly from diatribes contemporary with Stertinus and himself.[437]

H. Cicero: Paradoxa Stoicorum

Additional evidence for the nature of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe would seem to be provided by Cicero's Paradoxa Stoicorum which C. W. Mendell has described as "...the best extant examples..." of the diatribe as originated by Bion, the Cynic,[438] and which, as one immediately notices, deal with Stoic paradoxes such as the one used by Horace in the satire discussed above. A study of Cicero's own comments about his Paradoxa and of his treatment of six Stoic paradoxes will show that a more accurate description is that of André Oltramare, who states (p. 117) that "ses Paradoxa Stoicorum ne sont pas pour lui un ouvrage philosophique mais une série d'exercices oratoires sur des thèmes stoïco-cyniques qui lui paraissent audacieux et séduisants. Ni leur style, ni leur fond ne peuvent nous donner un renseignement précis sur les sources de Cicéron: la morale populaire y est mêlée a des paradoxes du stoïcisme traditionnel d'école." Cicero begins his own description of the Paradoxa with the comment that Cato "...cum in senatu sententiam diceret locos graves ex philosophia tractare abhorrentes ab hoc usu forensi et publico, sed dicendo consequi tamen ut illa etiam populo probabilia viderentur..." (Paradoxa, Prooemium, 1-2).[439] Further, while Cato "...de magnitudine animi de continentia de morte de omni laude virtutis de dis immortalibus de caritate patriae Stoice solet oratoriis ornamentis adhibitis dicere...," Cicero himself "...ludens..." has thrown "...in communes locos..." those concepts "...quae vix in gymnasiis et in otio Stoici probant..." by which he means the Stoic παράδοξα which are topics "...admirabilia contraque opinionem omnium..." (Paradoxa, Prooemium, 3-4). The author adds that he wished to see whether these paradoxes could be "...proferri in lucem, id est in forum, et ita dici ut probarentur, an alia quaedam esset erudita alia popularis oratio...." (Paradoxa, Prooemuim, 4). For this reason he then tells Brutus, to whom the work is addressed, that he will receive "...hoc parvum opusculum..." and taste a "...genus exercitationum..." which Cicero is accustomed to use when he transfers "...cum ea quae dicuntur in scholis θετικῶς ad nostrum hoc oratorium...dicendi genus..." (*Paradoxa*, *Prooemium*, 5). This last statement seems to bear out Oltramare's conclusion that these paradoxes are rhetorical exercises, especially since Quintilian (X, v.11)[440] in discussing the values of paraphrasing states "in hoc optime facient infinitae quaestiones, quas vocari θέσεις diximus, quibus Cicero iam princeps in re publica exerceri solebat...," thus apparently connecting the famous orator with the same practice which he himself mentions in the *Paradoxa*. One probably, then, should consider these short essays as examples of rhetorical *theses* (see above at footnote 222 ff.), developed in a more popularized fashion than they would have been if argued within a philosophical school, written in a style which resembles the diatribe, and perhaps also the *schola*, which, as was noted above (see at footnote 229), may be a form of *thesis*. Further, the use of paradoxical topics connects these works with the original tradition of the *thesis*, as described by Aristotle, which dealt with such themes (see above at footnote 223; cf. S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation*, p. 2). Another important observation concerning the nature of the *Paradoxa* has been made by Auguste Haury in his *L'Ironie* et *L'Humour chez Cicéron* (Leiden, 1955). According to Haury (pp. 180-181) these paradoxes "...composés pendant les nuits printanières visent...les Attiques et illustrent la théorie par l'example...," and Cicero "...adopte ces opinions chères à Caton et à la

XUM

diatribe, mais se propose, en académicien comme Brutus, d'en tempérer l'aridité par l'abondance et l'agrément." The controversy between the proponents of the two types of style, commonly known as the Attic and the Asiatic, has been too well-discussed elsewhere to need comment here,[441] but the possibility that the Paradoxa had a place within this dispute removes them farther from the actual diatribal tradition and closer to the rather academic realm of works composed to illustrate the possibilities of a certain type of style.

Although the Paradoxa are not actual diatribes, they deserve a brief analysis which will serve to point out their diatribal nature. Further, if one compares the analysis of these essays with that of Horace's satire (II, 3) discussed above and with that of the works of Bion and Teles, the differences in style and treatment are quite apparent. Perhaps the least diatribal of the paradoxes, first of all, is paradoxon IV which deals with the same topic considered by Stertinus in Horace's satire, the paradox that "omnem stultum insanire," but uses that theme against Cicero's political enemies who sent him into exile. The beginning of the essay is mangled, but the phrase (IV, 27), "ego vero te non stultum, ut saepe, non improbum, ut semper, sed dementum esse et insanire...," followed by a lacuna which begins the question "...rebus ad victum necessariis esse invictum potest, sapientis animus magnitudine consilii tolerantia fortunae, rerum humanarum contemptione, virtutibus denique omnibus ut moenibus septus, vincetur et expugnabitur?...," establishes the theme, indicates the exclusion of the sage from the common state of madness (cf. Horace, Serm. II, 3, 45-46), and shows that Cicero is attacking an enemy, obviously Clodius (cf. R. Hirzel, Der Dialog, I, 497, note 2), as he develops his antithesis between the madman and the sage. After noting that the animus of the sage "...ne civitate quidem pelli potest...," Cicero uses a series of rhetorical questions to lead his imaginary interlocutor (indicated by the "Certe negabis.") to the conclusion, expressed, of course, by Cicero himself, that (IV, 27), "non igitur erat illa tum civitas cum leges in ea nihil valebant, cum iudicia iacebant, cum mos patrius occiderat, cum ferro pulsis magistratibus senatus nomen in republica non erat...," a statement noteworthy for its anaphora, asyndeton, and homoeoteleuton, figures prominent in the diatribe but also part of standard rhetoric. The author then turns from argument to direct attack when he adds (IV, 27), "praedonum ille concursus et te duce latrocinium in foro constitutum et reliquiae coniurationis a Catilinae furiis ad tuum scelus furoremque conversae non civitas erat...," once again emphasizing his contention that Rome was not a state when it was in turmoil. Throughout these lines Cicero is using the Socratic method of drawing admissions from his adversary by skillful questioning, a method which he himself describes in de Inventione (I, xxxi.51, ed. E. Stroebel) when he writes, "inductio est oratio quae rebus non dubiis captat assensiones eius quicum instituta est; quibus assensionibus facit ut illi dubia quaedam res propter similitudinem earum rerum quibus assensit probetur....", That this was Socrates' method also is noted by the Roman orator who states later in the same treatise (de Inventione, I, xxxi.53), "hoc modo sermonis plurimum Socrates usus est propterea quod nihil ipse afferre ad persuadendum volebat, sed ex eo quod sibi ille dederat quicum disputabat, aliquid conficere malebat, quod ille ex eo quod iam concessisset necessario approbare deberet." When he uses this method in the Paradoxa, Cicero, of course, has a distinct advantage, for his adversary Clodius was dead by the time that the Paradoxa appeared (46 B.C., cf. Haury, op. cit., p. 180) and thus the author can supply both questions and answers for his exceedingly imaginary

XUM

interlocutor.[442] Despite this advantage Cicero does follow his own rules (cf. de Inventione, I, xxxii.53) and begins with a proposition which is easily accepted (that a state is not a gathering "ferorum et immanium...") and then leads into the conclusion, quoted above, which is directed against Clodius, ostensibly with his own help. The reference to Catiline, further, and of scelus in connection with Clodius gives the passage a color[443] or slant against Cicero's enemy which augments the incriminating effect of the argument.

Cicero then reveals the point of his argument, in addition to the attack on Clodius, when he claims that he was not banished (i.e. exiled) from the state "...quae nulla erat..." (IV, 28), but that he was summoned back "...cum esset in republica consul qui tum nullus fuerat, esset senatus qui tum occiderat, esset consensus populi liberi, esset iuris et aequitatis, quae vincula sunt civitatis, repetita memoria...," a statement which, in its anaphora, homoeoteleuton, and parallelism with the previous comment about the characteristics of the non-existent state, creates an effective antithesis and completes Cicero's first argument. One should note, further, that in basing his argument on the definition of the term civitas Cicero has employed the "constitutio definitiva" (see above at footnote 432 and following) and claimed that since the state was not by definition a state when it allegedly exiled him, then he was by definition not a real exile. The question of why, then, he had to be summoned back once the state was reconstituted, conveniently is avoided.

The passages which follow basically are elaborations on the theme of the lawlessness of Clodius as opposed to the integrity of Cicero, or, in other words, the madness of the former as opposed to the sanity of the latter. In an especially scornful passage (IV, 28-29), first of all, the author expresses his contempt for the violence of Clodius, stating that none of his attempts

XUM

at injury ever reached the orator and then adding, in a remark directly addressed to Clodius, "...nisi forte cum parietes disturbabas aut cum tectis sceleratas faces inferebas meorum aliquid ruere aut deflagrare arbitrabare." The almost jingling homoeoteleuton of this passage is followed by the declaration (IV, 29), "nihil neque meum est neque cuiusquam quod auferri quod eripi quod amitti potest...," which seems to express, with the aid of anaphora, asyndeton, homoeoteleuton, and isocolon, the diatribal theme that the possession of things which can be lost is not a good (Oltramare, theme 12, p. 46) and also, in view of the next two sentences, includes the theme that virtue is the only good (Oltramare, theme 48, p. 54), although Cicero and the Cynics possibly would have argued over the meaning of the term "virtue." With the aid of anaphora and homoeoptoton the author elaborates on these themes by enumerating[444] the ways in which Clodius could have injured him. Cicero declares (IV, 29) that if his enemy had snatched away "...divinam animi mei constantiam...," or "...conscientiam meis curis vigiliis consiliis stare te invitissimo rempublicam...," or if Clodius had destroyed "...huius aeterni beneficii immortalem memoriam..." or the "...mentem unde haec consilia manarunt...," then the orator would admit that he had been injured. Since, however, Clodius could do none of this, then, according to Cicero, "...reditum mihi gloriosum iniuria tua dedit, non exitum calamitosum...," an obvious antithesis intended to stress Cicero's glory and his enemy's disgrace. As the summary of the content of this section shows, the author has abandonned his first method, inductio, for a deductive argument which, while setting out to prove that Clodius has been unable to harm Cicero, slips into its conclusion the additional contention that the orator's enemy has provided a "reditum gloriosum" for Cicero,[445] a statement which has not been proven in this argument but which harks back to Cicero's claims, in the previous section, concerning his return to the state. The effect on the unwary listener, of course, is to make Clodius look ridiculous, even though the author actually has proved nothing and has only enunciated a philosophical commonplace, applying it then to his own situation in a persuasive manner.

After completing the argument described above, the author then, in the final section of Paradoxon IV, once again employs the constitutionem definitivam as he attempts to prove that Clodius actually was an exile even though he remained at Rome, creating thereby almost a paradox within a paradox. Cicero's opening remark (IV, 29), "...ergo ego semper civis, et tum maxime cum meam salutem senatus exteris nationibus ut civis optimi commendabat: tu ne nunc quidem, nisi forte idem esse hostis et civis potest...," is an excellent example of adjusting a definition to suit one's own purposes, for, although in section 27 the orator argued that the state ceased to exist for a time and therefore did not exile him, in this section he refuses to admit that he ever ceased to be a citizen, even when he had no state. The force of the antithesis with its emphasis on Clodius as an enemy and non-citizen, however, helps to conceal the inconsistency, which must not be considered a logical error on the part of the author, who obviously knows what he is doing. Cicero immediately takes up the paradox of a civis who is also a hostis when he asks Clodius, "an tu civem ab hoste natura ac loco, non animo factisque distinguis?" With a skillful use of homoeoteleuton and alliteration, made more emphatic by asyndeton, the orator summarizes the crimes of his enemy ("caedem in foro fecisti, armatis latronibus templa tenuisti, privatorum domos, aedes sacras incendisti...") in a manner possibly intended to recall the threatened dangers from Catiline (cf. Catilinarian I and III), with whom Cicero earlier compared him (IV, 27), as well as the actual deeds of Clodius. The sarcastic question (IV, 30), "cur hostis Spartacus si tu civis?...," effectively concludes this line of argument which provides a brief example of the use of *subiectio* or *hypophora* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium,* IV, xxii.33) which occurs "...cum interrogamus adversarios aut quaerimus ipsi quid ab illis aut quid contra nos dici possit; dein subicimus id quod oportet dici aut non opportet, aut nobis adiumento futurum sit aut offuturum sit idem contrario....". Here Cicero obviously intends the *subiectio* to work against his opponent.

After laying a foundation through his reference to his enemy's criminal activities, cited above, the author launches into his attempt to prove that Clodius is the real exile and asks him (IV, 30), "potes autem tu esse civis propter quem aliquando civitas non fuit, et me tuo nomine appellas cum omnes meo discessu exsulasse rempublicam putent?" Cicero here, as in section 29, may be making use of a common diatribal topic, for, as Oltramare notes (p. 118) Diogenes of Sinope, when told (Diogines Laertius, VI, 49), "'Σινωπεῖς σου φυγὴν κατέγνωσαν,...," replied, "'ἐγὼ δέ γε...ἐκείνων μονήν....".[446] Next, after two rhetorical questions addressed to Clodius, the "...homo amentissime...," the author indicates the "constitutio" which he is adopting, when he inquires (IV, 30-31), "Nescis exilium scelerum esse poenam, meum illud iter ob praeclarissimas res a me gestas esse susceptum?...," and then states that "omnes scelerati atque impii(quorum tu te ducem esse profiteris) quos leges esilio affici volunt exules sunt etiam si solum non mutarunt...." To prove his definition of an exile Cicero quotes sections of the law and follows each quotation with an example of his enemy's violation of that law (IV, 31), sufficient to make him both a criminal and an exile. One should note within this section the effective use of anaphora and of parallelism in the legal phrases which gives the passage a certain crispness as well as solemnity. Following this effective demonstration of his enemy's culpability, Cicero brings out his strongest weapon, the fact that (IV, 32) Clodius' "familarissimus...de te privilegium tulit ut si in opertum Bonae Deae accessisses exulares...," and that, despite this, Clodius boasts that he has done so, thus confessing a crime, and, in Cicero's view, making himself an exile. The author, after asking Clodius why he does not fear the "nomen exulis" when he has been "...tot legibus in exilium eiectus...," and supposedly receiving the answer "...Romae sum..." (IV, 32), sarcastically adds "et quidem in operto fuisti...." With the remark "non igitur ubi quisque erit eius loci ius tenebit si ibi eum legibus esse non oportebit...," the orator concludes his proof that Clodius is an exile by stressing that he is not protected from that title when he is in the very city whose laws he has violated. Thus, the treatment of the paradox "omnem stultum insanire" ends with a statement which makes no reference to the alleged theme but which does indicate Cicero's intention to attack Clodius, using the paradox only as a point of departure.

From the analysis given above one must conclude that Paradoxon IV is not a diatribe such as those composed by Bion and Teles or as that by Stertinus "recorded" by Horace, but rather a rhetorical composition which seems to serve multiple purposes. In the first place, while Cicero allegedly has developed a composition based on the paradoxical thesis "omnem stultum insanire," taking Clodius as an example of the man who is both stupid and mad, he actually has written what amounts to a legal indictment of his enemy, based on the "constitutio definitiva" and developed as if the author were arguing a case in a court of law. A second purpose of *Paradoxon IV* is obviously a political one, for, while Cicero is attacking his opponent primarily with legalistic arguments, he still is attempting to discredit Clodius and his political activities and to glorify his own response to those activities. This attempt to glorify and justify his own actions reveals a third purpose of the composition which can be described most effectively if one quotes once again a section of the definition of διατριβή given by Hermogenes (see above at footnote 11) who states,,"διατριβή ἐστι βραχέος διανοήματος ἠθικοῦ ἔκτασις, ἵνα ἐμμείνῃ τὸ ἦθο τοῦ λέγοντος ἐν τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ ἀκούοντος....". In other words Cicero's *Paradoxon IV* serves as an excellent example of the diatribe as defined by Hermogenes (and who cites the prooemium of Demosthenes' Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου as his example) which, as was noted above (see discussion following footnote 11), has been applied erroneously and anachronistically to the works of Bion, Teles, and their imitators. One should not apply the term "διατριβή," even in the Hermogenean sense, to *Paradoxon IV*, however, since to do so would produce confusion,and since one cannot prove that the term "διατριβή" meant the same thing to Cicero and to Hermogenes even though the device itself is the same for both. Further, one must stress again that this composition is not a Cynic-Stoic diatribe,for, even though it contains a polemic tone and certain rhetorical devices, it still lacks the majority of the diatribe's stylistic traits and especially *spoudaiogeloion*, even though Cicero has maintained an ironic tone through most of the work. The legalistic bent of the argument and the stress on technical definitions applied directly to Clodius rather than on a general moral topic also serve to remove *Paradoxon IV* from the genre of diatribe. Thus, one cannot use this Ciceronian

XUM

composition in the same fashion as one could use Horace's creation of a diatribe by Stertinus, to illustrate the genre known as the Cynic-Stoic diatribe.

In contrast to the fourth paradox, Paradoxon I, although not an actual diatribe, still contains many of the features of that genre. This composition dealing with the topic "quod honestum sit id solum bonum esse" is developed in a manner which would prove a good example for a textbook on rhetoric. Beginning with a captatio benevolentiae[447] Cicero expresses his fear that the listener will not realize that the speech comes from the author's own judgement and states (I, 6), "dicam quod sentio tamen, et dicam brevius quam res tanta poscit...," a simulated apologia in advance. The author then works his way into his main topic by first developing the theme that material wealth is not a good. Following an enumeration, connected by the frequent use of neque, of commonly desired possessions, Cicero notes that (I, 6), "neque enim umquam expletur nec satiatur cupiditatis sitis, neque solum ea qui habent libidine augendi cruciantur sed etiam amittendi metu." The anaphora, alliteration, and chiasmus (...libidine augendi...amittendi metu) found in this passage are, of course, figures commonly found in the diatribal style, but, since they also belong to the rhetorical tradition, they cannot be used alone to indicate dependence on the diatribe. Of greater importance is the image of greed as an insatiable thirst which is reminiscent of Bion's comparison involving the person with dropsy (see above after footnote 300) and this possibly may be traced back to the diatribal tradition.

Cicero continues his discussion with a criticism of the nation's ancestors (I, 7), "...qui haec imbecilla et commutabilia verbo bona putaverunt appellanda cum re ac factis longe aliter iudicavissent...," and then asks, playing upon

XUM

the varied meanings of bona (almost a constitutio definitiva) and using emphatic anaphora, "potestne bonum cuiquam malo esse, aut potest quisquam in abundantia bonorum esse non bonus?" After noting the paradox that "goods" can help the wicked and harm the good (a remark highlighted by the use of improbi and probis), the author observes that he will never say that (I, 8) "...bona perdidisse...si qui pecus aut superllectilem amiserit...," a comment which leads him into an anecdote concerning Bias, one of the seven wise men of Greece. Cicero tells how, when the enemy had taken his city Priene and other people were attempting to carry away some of their possessions as they fled, Bias answered someone who urged him to do likewise with the reply (I, 8) "Ego vero... facio, nam omnia mecum porto mea." The author next concludes this first section with the remark that Bias (I, 9) "...haec ludibria fortunae ne sua quidem putavit quae nos appellamus etiam bona...," a statement which definitely reflects several diatribal themes, but especailly those described in Oltramare's general list (p. 46) as "la possession de ce qu'on peut perdre ne donne pas le bonheur et n'est par conséquent pas un bien...," "les dons de la fortune sont des prêts sans valeur...," and "tous les dons de la fortune sont indifferents."[448] In addition to these themes, the use of an anecdote concerning a wise Greek and especially the inclusion of dialogue within that anecdote are signs of possible diatribalinfluence, although, once again, it must be stressed that such anecdotes are part of the store of rhetorical devices common to the diatribe and other rhetorical genres.[449] The use of a Greek-oriented anecdote along with themes which can be traced to Antisthenes and to Ariston of Chios, however, makes diatribal influence or imitation of a diatribe on the part of Cicero a reasonable probability.

The purpose of this whole first section, from 6-9, has been to prepare the imaginary audience for the main topic, thus fulfilling one of the main purposes of an exordium.. Especially important for this function is the criticism of wealth (6), the establishment of the varied meanings of "bona" (7), and the anecdote (8) concerning Bias, for each of these is part of the method succinctly described by Cicero when, in de Inventione (I, xvi. 23), he observes that "dociles auditores faciemus si aperte et breviter summam causae exponemus, hoc est, in quo consistat controversia. Nam et, cum docilem velis facere, simul attentum facias oportet."[450] The author then concludes his exordium and begins the discussion of his main point with the question (9) "Quid est igitur...bonum?...," attributed to an imaginary interlocutor, a strong indication of diatribal influence (see above at footnotes 95 and 98). This query is answered immediately by the definition (9), "si quod recte fit et honeste et cum virtute id bene fieri vere dicitur, quod rectum et honestum et cum virtute est id solum opinor bonum." In making a definition the starting point of the main body of his essay Cicero apparently is following a standard practice of the Stoics who, just like Stertinus in Horace's Serm. II, 3, commenced "...their formal discourses with exact definition of their terms."[451] One cannot discount, however, the additional influence of the author's rhetorical training, which not only familiarized him with the "constitutio definitiva" but also with definitio as a figure of speech (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxv. 35) and as a part of the theory of topics (Cicero, Topica, II, 9 and IV, 26 ff.). Whatever its source, the definition serves the purpose of indicating the main topic of the essay and fulfills a function similar to that of the partitio, found in judicial or deliberative speeches, which "...rerum distributam continet expositionem..."

XUM

and employs "...brevitatem, absolutionem, paucitatem..." (de Inventione, I, xxii. 32). It is interesting, further, to note the simplicity of this definition as compared to one such as the following which appears in the de Finibus (II, xiv. 45; ed. T. Schiche, rep. 1961, Teubner):

> Honestum igitur id intellegimus quod tale est ut detracta omni utilitate sine ullis praemiis fructibusve per se ipsum possit iure laudari.

Since the argument and manner of proof in Paradoxon IV are more popular and rhetorical than the often intricate ones in a treatise such as the de Finibus, the author can use a simpler definition and depend upon his examples to prove his contention to an audience perhaps assumed to be less critical than the interlocutors of the de Finibus.

After he has presented his definition of "bonum," Cicero states that (10) since "...haec videri possunt odiosiora cum lentius disputantur...," they must be illustrated by the lives and deeds of famous men. This remark obviously is intended to maintain the good will and interest of his audience by indicating that the discussion to follow will not be a dry one based on technical details, and thus it serves a function similar to that of the exordium.[452] In the collection of exempla which follows (in sections 10-12) the contrast between a work such as the Paradoxa, written as if intended to make certain Stoic doctrines palatable to a wide audience, and as work such as the de Finibus, intended for educated Romans interested in Greek philosophy, is quite evident, for, while Paradoxon I employs numerous examples not only to explain its position but also to interest its auditors, the de Finibus appends to its definition of honestum, quoted above, only the following (II, xiv. 45) comments, before progressing to a discussion of the importance of reason:

> Quod quale sit, non tam definitione, qua sum usus, intellegi potest (quamquam aliquantum potest) quam communi omnium iudicio et optimi cuiusque studiis atque factis, qui permulta ob eam unam causam faciunt quia decet, quia rectum, quia honestum est, etsi nullum consecuturum emolumentum vident.

Thus, the method used to develop the theme varies considerably, but one should note that in both works the author has chosen to refer to the actions of great men to illustrate his definition.

Cicero begins his series of exempla with a rhetorical question in which he asks, using a group of parallel phrases connected by aut, whether those who handed down a republic "...tam praeclare fundatum..." ever had any thought (10) "...aut argenti ad avaritiam aut amoenitatum ad delectationem aut supellectilis ad delicias aut epularum ad voluptates?" After this enumeration of material goods, each of which is a frequent diatribal topic,[453] the author provides a division for his exempla by asking his audience whether they wish to begin with Romulus as representative of the kings or (and here Cicero uses the etymological figure) "...post liberam civitatem ab eis ipsis qui liberaverunt eam?" The merits of Romulus and Numa Pompilius then are mentioned through two rhetorical questions which stress the deeds and virtues of Romulus and the simplicity of Numa Pompilius, whose "...capidines ac fictiles hirnulas..." were as pleasing to the gods as the engraved libation bowls of other men. Passing over the other kings with the notation that all except Tarquinus Superbus were equal, Cicero adds another series of rhetorical questions, beginning with one in which he asks whether, if one sought from Brutus and his associates, who freed Rome from its kings, why they acted as they did, "...quis existat cui voluptas cui divitiae cui denique praeter officium fortis et magni viri quidquam aliud propositum fuisse videatur?" Other rhetorical questions follow, and, as they deal with Roman heroes such as Gaius Mucius, Cocles, Gnaeus and Publius Scipio, and finally Scipio Africanus (older and younger) and Cato the elder, create an emotional pitch which appeals to the patriotism of the audience and must convince them, without any actual proof, that no one in his right mind would prefer to own material goods rather than to possess the nobility of a Gaius Fabricius "...qui nihil eorum habuit nihil habere voluit..." (13).[454]

Now that the author presumably has convinced his audience of the superiority of moral good as opposed to material goods, he launches his attack on those who, while granting the fact that those things (14) "...quae modo huc modo illuc transferuntur..." are not "...in rebus bonis...," claim that pleasure (voluptas) is the highest good. Cicero wastes no time in defining pleasure, but rather contemptuously dismisses the proponents of pleasure with the remark "quae quidem mihi vox pecudum videtur esse, non hominum...," followed by an appeal to the pride of his audience in which he addresses them, using the singular to maintain the fiction of an interlocutor, even though he must have a larger audience in mind, and asks (14)," tu, cum tibi sive deus sive mater ut ita dicam rerum omnium natura dederit animum quo nihil est praestantius neque divinius, sic te ipse abicies atque prosternes ut nihil inter te atque quadrupedem aliquam putes interesse?" The fallacy of this approach is obvious, to one who listens carefully, since Cicero has not proven that pleasure and quadrupeds are inextricably connected or that pleasure and intelligence cannot coexist. By no means, however, must the lack of a logical argument here be considered unintentional, for the author realizes that the emotional tone of the preceding sections makes his audience susceptible to an additional emotional appeal which plays on the pride of the audience at the same time as it

XUM

downgrades Cicero's opponents, namely the Epicureans. The approach being used in this section is the same as that commonly used in the exordium of a speech, but equally applicable elsewhere, through which the author attempts to discredit his opponent by, among other means, bringing him into contempt through the mention of his "...inertia, neglegentia, ignavia, desidiosum studium et luxuriosum otium..." (de Inventione, I, xvi. 22). Further, an orator also in the exordium may attempt to secure the favor of his audience in several ways, and mainly, as Cicero advices in the de Inventione (I, xvi. 22), "...si res ab eis fortiter, sapienter, mansuete gestae proferentur, ut ne qua assentatio nimia significetur, si de eis quam honesta existimatio sit ostendetur...." Therefore, in Paradoxon I, 14, the orator stresses the voluptatem of his opponents and the animum of his audience (or interlocutor).[456] This playing upon the prejudice and vanity of the listeners provides another illustration of the stylistic differences between a popular work such as this and a serious treatise such as the de Finibus. In the latter work Cicero also refers to intelligence when he states, after a reference to the illustrative value of the deeds of great men, (II, xiv. 45), "homines enim, etsi aliis multis, tamen hoc uno plurimum a bestiis differunt quod rationem habent a natura datam mentemque acrem et vigentem celerrimeque multa simul agitantem et, ut ita dicam, sagacem....". The similarity in subject matter between this passage and Paradoxon I, 14, is obvious, and not surprising since the same author wrote both works and perhaps used the same source for both. Equally obvious, however, is the difference in tone, for while the Paradoxon appeals emotionally to the listener's vanity in an attempt to win support, the treatise states arguments and opinions in a serious fashion. Thus, the same theme can be made to serve divergent purposes in separate works once it has been adapted to the style and purpose of each.

XUM

Having prejudiced his auditors, Cicero uses rhetorical questions to create an argument which can be reduced to a syllogism if one rephrases the questions as declarative sentences. The first premise (15), if paraphrased, is then "there is no good thing which does not make its owner better." As proof for this statement, the author adds an enthymeme composed of a maxim and its reason,[455] as follows:

> ut enim est quisque maxime boni particeps ita est laudabilis maxime, neque est ullum bonum de quo non is qui id habeat honeste possit gloriari.

The second premise follows this enthymeme and can be paraphrased as "Pleasure does not make one better." One must note here that this paraphrase combines the meaning of the questions, "quid autem est horum in voluptate? melioremne efficit aut laudabiliorem virum? an quisquam in potiundis voluptatibus gloriando se et praedicatione effert?...," which both state and "prove" the premise. The conclusion, "therefore, pleasure is not a good," is omitted by the author, who instead adds the concluding sentence "atqui si voluptas quae plurimorum patrociniis defenditur in rebus bonis habenda non est, eaque quo est maior eo magis mentem e sua sede et statu demovet, profecto nihil est aliud bene st beate vivere nisi honeste et recte vivere...," which, repeating in slightly different form the essence of Cicero's definition of bonum, actually serves a the first premiss of an argument in which the second premise and conclusion may be omitted as obvious. Placed at the end of the argument against pleasure, however, it is intended to serve as the conclusion of that argument, even though, by strict logic, it cannot so serve. Once again, the author can depend on the force of his rhetorical questions and appeal to the prejudices of his listeners to create the illusion of actual

XUM

proof (cf. footnote 445). It should be here that the form of the argument concerning pleasure, excluding this final sentence, is that described by Cicero, in de Inventione (I, xxxiv. 57 ff.) as ratiocinatio or deductive reasoning composed of three, four, or five separate parts, depending upon the presence or absence of proof for each premiss (cf. I, xxxvii. 67).[457]

Now that the rhetorical analysis of Paradoxon I has been completed, one has some basis upon which to judge its relation to the diatribal tradition. The use of certain themes, which have been noted in the discussion, the inclusion of an anecdote concerning the Greek Bias, the employment of an imaginary interlocutor, the use of multiple exempla, and, finally the mildly polemic tone of sections 14 and 15 are all indicators of diatribal influence. Significantly absent, however, are any references to poets or poetic quotations, a strongly polemic tone, multiple anecdotes, a prosopopoiia, and, above all, any real spoudaiogeloion. One, therefore, should concede that the Paradoxon probably has been influenced by the diatribe, but deny that it is anything other than a rhetorical composition dealing with a Stoic paradox.[458] Other examples from Cicero's Paradoxa could be discussed here, especially Paradoxa II and V which feature a very polemic tone and numerous diatribal themes, but among all of the Paradoxa, there is not one which contains within itself sufficient distinctive traits to allow it to be called a diatribe of the type produced by the Cynics and by Stoics such as Stertinus. From the analyses of Paradoxa I and IV and of the speech of Stertinus in Horace's Sermones II, 3, however one should be able to draw some idea of the nature of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, as the genre must be called in view of its principal users, although one may draw examples of only a few traits and themes from Cicero's work and must rely on Horace's exaggerated version for an indication of the work of the

Stoics whom Panaetius called "...paene Cynici..." (see above after footnote 392). It is possible, of course, that some of Cicero's Paradoxa represent a modified diatribal tradition, midway between the Cynics and Cynic-like Stoics, but this possibility cannot be proved and should be abandonned as an attempt to force the Paradoxa into a genre in which they do not belong.

I. The Diatribe and Roman Satire: Ennius and Lucilius

The influence of the diatribe as used by the Cynics and Stoics was considerable, as must be evident from the examples given throughout this study and from the work of Johannes Geffcken (Kynika und Verwandtes, Heidelberg 1909), who has discussed the influence of the diatribe on Hellenistic poetry (pp. 1-44), and of André Oltramare, who has traced the influence of the genre on the writings of such divergent Roman authors as Cato the Elder and Terence, as well as on those of other writers. A full discussion of the studies by Geffcken and Oltramare need not be undertaken here, but one should note that, while the diatribe made its mark on Hellenistic and Roman writings, some of these writings in turn undoubtedly were influential on the later diatribes which took poetic quotations from Greek and Roman verse, thus sometimes completing a circle of dependence. Two Roman authors, Ennius and Lucilius, although mentioned by Oltramare, deserve at least a brief discussion here in terms of their relationship to the diatribe, since both played an important role in the development of Roman satire, and since both were influential predecessors of Lucretius.

By studying the fragments of Ennius, first of all, one can discern some elements which may be the result of diatribal influence.[459] Of primary interest, of course, are the Saturae, since these works seem to have absorbed some of the spirit of the diatribe, as well as some of its stylistic traits.

Oltramare, following, as he notes, Birt, *Zwei politische Satiren des alten Rom* (Marburg, 1888; p. 18, note 1), comments concerning the *Saturae* that (p. 75) "dans l'esprit d'Ennius, ce titre collectif désignait des poésies mêlées de type σπουδαιογέλοιον; la forme dialoguée y dominait et différenciait la *satura* des poèmes analogues (παίγνια, silles, parodies, iambes, etc.) où une conversation developpée n' intervenait que très exceptionnellement."[460] One must be cautious, however, about designating all of the *Saturae* as examples of *spoudaiogeloion*, since so few fragments remain, and one, therefore, cannot be certain that all of the poems contained this type of humor, which is both serious and amusing at the same time, and cannot prove that the term *saturae* referred to any mixture beyond that of poems in different meters concerning varied subjects.[461] The *spoudaiogeloion* noticed by Oltramare in the surviving fragments may be the result of an acquaintance with the diatribal tradition or may be due to the influence of Hellenistic poets who were familiar with the Cynic form of humor (see footnote 459 and C. A. van Rooy, *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*, Leiden, 1966; pp. 36-37). Ennius himself, according to Aulus Gellius (VI, 91) wrote in his *Saturae*,

> non est meum ac si me canis memorderit...,

which perhaps can be construed as a derogatory reference to the biting polemic of some Cynics, although the poet could mean that he himself does not write in an ill-humored fashion or he could be referring to some well-known maxim or fable.[462] As an example of humor which resembles mild *spoudaiogeloion*, the following lines should be examined (fr. 14-19, Warmington):

> Quippe sine cura laetus lautus cum advenis
> infercits malis expeditio bracchio,
> alacer celsus, lupino expectans impetu -
> mox cum tu alterius abligurias bona
> quid censes domino esse animi? Pro divum fidem
> is tristest dum cibum servat, tu ridens voras.

XUM

These fragments, which, with a change of meter, would fit easily into a speech in a Roman comedy concerning a parasite, may have drawn their mild yet critical humor from the tradition of Greek New Comedy (but cf. C. A. van Rooy, p. 41). Further, their description of a standard character type, the play on the similar words laetus and lautus, the antithesis in the final line between "is tristest" and "tu ridens," and the use of a rhetorical question are all traits which can be found in comedies as well as in diatribes, and which may be derived ultimately from a common source, namely the rhetorical characteres written by Theophrastus and other Peripatetics. Thus, this example, while showing some mild spoudaiogeloion, cannot be used as a definite example of Cynic-Stoic influence on Ennius.

Diatribal influence on other apparently humorous passages is equally uncertain. For example, the comment (fr. 21, Warmington),

> Numquam poetor nisi si podager,

need be attributed to no source beyond the poet himself, although he could have been inspired by some Hellenistic model. Further, the exclamation (fr. 23, Warmington),

> Simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis!...,

which provides a sample of Ennius' well-known fondess for alliteration, need not be seen as necessarily reflecting the comparisons of men and animals sometimes found in the diatribe, as Oltramare thinks (p. 75), since such comparisons are common in other genres,[463] and indeed it cannot even be assumed to show spoudaiogeloion in its original context. One additional example which should be cited here is the tangled wordplay (fr. 28-31, Warmington) through which the poet observes,

> Nam qui lepide postulat alterum frustrari
> quem frustratur frustra eum dicit frustra esse;
> nam qui sese frustrari quem frustra sentit,
> qui frustratur frustra est si non ille est frustra.

The repetition of *frustra* (forming the figure *traductio*; cf. *Rhetorica ad* Herennium, IV, xiv. 20), along with the *figura etymologica* of *frustratur frustra*, when combined with the humor created by the tangled phrases and the character sketch which they convey, could point to a diatribal source which made use of all of these devices to hold the interest of an audience. It is at least equally possible, however, that these lines reflect the influence of an excited or crafty speech in a comedy, although such a passage, appearing in a Roman or late Hellenistic comedy, could indicate some familiarity with the diatribe or its methods. The confusion produced by the wording and subject matter of the passage does suggest an ultimate source which is neither the diatribe nor New Comedy, for Ennius' discussion of the cheater resembles the famous paradox of the liar, which, although possibly originating with Eubulides of the Megarian school, is found in Aristotle's *de Sophisticis Elenchis* (XXV, 180a 39-180b2)[464] in the following form:

> ...οὔτ᾽εἰ εὐορκεῖ τόδε ἢ τῇδε, ἀνάγκη καὶ εὐορκεῖν,
> ὁ δ᾽ὀμόσας ἐπιορκήσειν εὐορκεῖ ἐπιορκῶν τοῦτο μόνον,
> εὐορκεῖ δὲ οὔ· οὐδ᾽ὁ ἀπειθῶν πείθεται, ἀλλά τι πείθεται.

If Ennius' fragment is a parody of this logical paradox, then he perhaps has derived it from a source critical of logic, and perhaps especially critical of Stoic logic, since Stoics did work on this paradox (see footnote 464), although logicians from other schools also attempted to solve the problem. The well-known antipathy of the Cynics toward logic (cf. D. R. Dudley, p. 96) adds to the possibility that Ennius' source was some Cynic work, possibly a diatribe, which presented a ridiculous example resembling the famous paradox

XUM

which would be recognized for what it was by the well-educated and, at the same time, through the manner of its presentation, would entertain those not familiar with the paradox. Of course, some poet, even a playwright, could have presented a parody of logic, following the tradition of Aristophanes' portrayal of Socrates in the Clouds in which the teachings of that philosopher were ridiculed. One, therefore, should say only that the resemblance of Ennius' cheater to the paradoxical liar does not seem to be accidental and may derive from some Hellenistic source, probably a diatribe but also possibly a comic drama.

If the presence of spoudaiogeloion were the only allegedly diatribal element found in Ennius, then one would be forced to discard altogether the theory of diatribal influence on the Roman poet. Other common traits of the genre, however, seem to have been present in the Saturae. In Quintilian (IX, ii. 36; unnumbered fragment in Warmington, p. 395; quoted here from the edition by L. Radermacher, Teubner, 1959), for example, is found a reference to a prosopopoiia in Ennius. The Roman rhetorician observes in his discussion of that figure that "...formas quoque fingimus saepe, ut Famam Vergilius, ut Voluptatem ac Virtutem (quemadmodum a Xenophonte traditur) Prodicus, ut Mortem ac Vitam, quas contendere in satura tradit Ennius." The use of prosopopoiiai is not limited to the diatribe, as Quintilian's own statement indicates, and the Roman poet could have drawn on many sources, including Callimachus, when he wrote his argument between Life and Death, although, as C. A. van Rooy argues, the source of inspiration for Ennius was, probably a moralizing dispute between personified abstracts, such as one finds in the diatribe.[465] Another device commonly found in the diatribe (see after footnote 7 above and the fable of the frog in Horace, Sermones, II, 3, 314 ff.), but not limited to it, is the fable, which seems to have found expression in at least one of Ennius' *Saturae*, for Aulus Gellius (II, xxix. 20, ed. P. K. Marshall, Oxford, 1968; cf. Warmington, p. 389) recounts a fable by Aesop, which concerns a lark and her young, and then notes "hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in *Satiris* scite admodum et venuste versibus quadratis composuit." Following this remark, Gellius preserves the following passage, which, according to him, concluded Ennius' poem (cf. C. A. van Rooy, p. 35):

> Hoc erit tibi argumentum semper in promptu situm:
> Ne quid expectes amicos, quod tute agere possies.

If one entire *satura* has been devoted by the poet to this fable (cf. Warmington, p. 389), he is at variance with the habit of the diatribe which used fables as only one means of exemplification within a speech. Perhaps, then, one should not assume that Ennius' source of inspiration was a diatribe, in spite of "...the importance of the use of animal anecodote, with a moralizing application in Greek popular philosophy..." (C. A. van Rooy, p. 35). One should not forget that the diatribe is not the only genre which inserts fables into the midst of a discussion of argument and uses them for didactic purposes. Hesiod, in his *Works and Days*, for example, after describing the iron race of men, recounts a story concerning a hawk and a nightengale[466] and is credited by Quintilian (V, xi. 19) with being the "primus auctor" of fables. Further, since a collection of Aesop's fables was made by Demetrius of Phalerum (his λόγων Αἰσιωπείων συναγωγαί),[467] Ennius himself, who was obviously familiar with various types of Greek literature, could have used this or a similar collection of stories or have relied on a Hellenistic poet who versified fables.[468] A third possible source for the Roman poet is his own education, for, if he was trained in rhetoric as a boy, he probably followed a course of study similar to that which was described by Theon and Hermogenes in the first two centuries A.D. and which may be assumed to represent also the

XUM

practice of the Hellenistic age in which Ennius lived.[469] The first exercise within this system was the paraphrasing of Aesopic fables, concerning which practice Quintilian states (I, ix. 2), "igitur Aesopi fabellas, quae fabulis nutricularum proxime succedunt, narrare sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente, deinde eandem gracilitatem stilo exigere condiscant; versus primo solvere, mox mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et breviare quaedam et exornare solvo modo poetae sensu permittitur." If Ennius was trained in a similar fashion, then he easily could have paraphrased an Aesopic fable and put it into verse form, without seeking an external source of inspiration. Thus, in view of the alternatives which have been mentioned one cannot assume, and definitely cannot prove, that the composition of an Aesopic fable in Latin verse links Ennius to the diatribal tradition.

Since the traits which have been discussed thus far present, at best, inconclusive evidence concerning the influence of the diatribe on the Roman poet, one must examine the possibility that some of the themes which occur in Ennius' works may have been derived from that genre. Oltramare, first of all, has stated (p. 75) that the fragment (fr. 1, Warmington),

> Malo hercle magno suo convivat sine modo!,

reflects the diatribal topics "if faut _satisfaire_ _notre_ _faim_ _aussi_ _simplement_ _que_ _possible_..." (p. 50, theme 31) and "_l'exercice_ est nécessaire à l'âme autant qu'au corps..." (p. 56, theme 52a). While the connection between the Latin fragment and Oltramare's second theme seems rather forced, and in fact unlikely, the first theme may have been the topic developed by Ennius if this line is representative of the satire as a whole. A line quoted out of context, as this one is, and preserved only because the grammarian Nonius was interested in the use of the verb "convivat" (Nonius, 474, 22; cf. Warmington, p. 384), however, provides highly questionable evidence for the contents of an entire poem and is itself also subject to misinterpretation. One, therefore, can state only that this line seems to reflect a diatribal theme. Further, since scenes of feasting and observations concerning the gluttonous or dissipated habits of various characters are elements commonly found in Greek, and later in Roman, comedy,[470] one should not eliminate the possibility that this line by Ennius was part of a poem describing or criticising such a scene or character derived from the theater. The problem of influence is made more complicated, of course, by the probability that the diatribe and comedy exerted mutual influence on each other. Thus, a diatribal theme can appear in a comedy (cf. Oltramare on Plautus and Terence, pp. 66-74)[471] and a comic theme or an example based on a scene from a play can appear in a diatribe (cf. Horace, Serm. II, 3) with the result that it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine which genre used a given theme first or whether both genres made use of a common philosophical source (as could have been the case with Bion and Menander, both of whom studied with Theophrastus).[472] The source for a theme concerning gluttony, if, indeed fragment 1 does deal with that topic, therefore, cannot be determined, just as the nature of the whole Ennian satire in which the fragment appeared cannot be ascertained on the basis of existing evidence.

Four other fragments of Ennius could have belonged to what C. A. van Rooy calls (p. 32), "...satirical pieces in which the poet describes and mocks or criticises harmful types in society...," although, once again, one cannot assert that the diatribe was the source for the poems to which these fragments belonged, however much they may resemble the diatribe in tone. The first of

XUM

these seems to refer to "busybodies" (van Rooy, p. 32), for, with an extravagant, but effective, use of a syndeton, homoeoteleuton, and alliteration, the poet writes.

Restitant occurrunt obstant obstringillant obagitant.

Possibly this line was part of a character sketch depicting a man displaying the trait which Theophrastus calls "ἀκαιρία," noting that "...ὁ δὲ ἄκαιρος τοιοῦτός τις, οἷος ἀσχολουμένῳ προσελθὼν ἀνακοινοῦσθαι..." (*Characteres*, XII, 1.2-3). That Ennius may have written a poem dealing with, and criticising, a character type similar to one found in Theophrastus' *Characteres*, however, does not mean that the Roman poet was dependent on the Peripatetic tradition for a source, since equally available to him were the character sketches found in Greek and Roman comedy and the diatribe, and, as a very probable source of inspiration, his own actual experience with such "busybodies" in Rome or elsewhere.[473] Perhaps influential on the form of the character sketch written by Ennius and by the authors of the older genres just mentioned was the rhetorical device known as ἠθοποιία or *notatio* in which (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, L. 63, "...alicuius natura certis describitur signis, quae, sicuti notae quae, naturae sunt adtributa...," and which was a prominent feature in the oratory of Lysias (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, p. 387, note d). The poet Ennius, then, had varried sources of inspiration available, but since only one line remains from his poem, one can make no definite pronouncement concerning influence from any quarter or even concerning the content, for this single line could have been only a reference made to "busybodies" which was included within a poem concerning another topic.

Two other fragments of Ennius deserve mention, since they have the form of maxims and a tone of criticism. The first of these attacks a slanderer (cf. C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., p. 32) by warning (fr. 8-9, Warmington),

XUM

> Nam is non bene vult tibi qui falso criminat
> aput te.

The context for this remark is unknown, and so one cannot know whether the poet directed his warning toward anyone in particular or whether he intended his remark to be a general statement. Also without a context are the observation (fr. 27, Warmington),

> Quaerunt in scirpo soliti quod dicere nodum...,

and the advice (fr. 2, Warmington),

> Dum quidquid des celere....

Warmington considers the first of these a remark directed against "ill-natured critics," which is a plausible interpretation of the maxim, provided that one does not limit the use of "critics" to literary critics. Of course, equally plausible would be an application of this proverb to any person who creates difficulties where none exist.[474] Without additional lines from the poem, one cannot distinguish reasonably between these two interpretations. The second proverb also is suitable for many contexts and can be given no interpretation beyond the advice it obviously gives. These three fragments have been mentioned here since their critical or moralising tone and proverbial character are traits common in diatribal literature. Obviously, however, the individual statements, devoid of context and of direct parallels in Cynic-Stoic literature, cannot be taken as evidence of the influence of the diatribal style on the Saturae of Ennius.

As a result of this discussion of the pertinent fragments of Ennius' Saturae, one must realize that there is an obvious lack of solid evidence upon which to base any theory of diatribal influence on Ennius. The humor, the themes, and the devices used all could have derived from several sources, including the poet's own experience and training. Further, the miscellaneous nature of the *Saturae* consisting of poems in various meters, "...including at least iambic senarii, trochaic septenarii, dactylic hexameters, and sotadices..." (C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., p. 32), and dealing with numerous unconnected topics, need not be traced back to the mixed nature of the diatribe with its rhetorical devices intended to command the attention of listeners. The Roman poet is equally likely to have been influenced by works such as the *Iambi* of Callimachus, which included a variety of topics as well as of meters,[475] or by the form of Hellenistic collections bearing titles such as Σύμμικτα, Σωρός, or Ἄτακτα.[476] Of course, one should not forget that the poets included in these collections could have been influenced by themes or devices of the diatribe[477] which then would have reached Ennius at second hand. One also should not rule out the possibility of direct diatribal influence on the Roman poet, even though, as has been stated repeatedly, actual evidence for that or for any definite source of influence is as scanty as the surviving fragments. Possibly the most reasonable conclusion to be drawn on the basis of the evidence is that of C. A. van Rooy (p. 43), who has stated concerning Ennius' *Saturae* that the work "...is, in fact, simply a combination - but in the sense of an aggregate, for it has no unity of its own - of elements borrowed or adapted from Greek literature (mainly didactic and moralising topics)...and elements due to personal achievement; the latter being topics reflecting both the author's personality and his interest in topical affairs, including criticism and mockery of obnoxious elements manifesting themselves in the metropolis."

Following Ennius, the poet Pacuvius also wrote saturas, but, as C. A. van Rooy observes (p. 53), it was the poet Lucilius who "by intensifying not the didactic or moralistic..., but the satiric element of the Ennian medley, ...first made the Latin 'satura' chiefly, though far from exclusively... satirical, and thereby became the founder of satire as a genre...," or, as Horace calls him (Sermones I, x. 48 and 66; cited by van Rooy, p. 53), the "inventor" of the genre of which Ennius was the "auctor." The works of this "inventor" are now represented by approximately 1300 lines (van Rooy, p. 51), which provide sufficient evidence to allow one to draw some conclusions about the style of the poet and his relationship to the diatribe, although one still must be careful not to read too much into fragments separated from their context. Before actually considering any evidence from the poet's own work, however, one must survey briefly Lucilius' background, in terms of his relationship to various philosophers, and also the evidence from other sources concerning the influence of comedy and the diatribe on the Roman poet.

Born in southern Italy, apparently to Roman citizens who held equestrian rank,[478] Lucilius must have received a proper education including training in Greek and in rhetoric and literature,[479] such as was customary for boys of his class and which would have prepared him for the study of philosophy in Greece. That Lucilius did at least visit Athens is indicated, as Fiske (p. 66) has observed, by the presence in his fragments of "...an intimacy with Athenian institutions and social usages, with vulgar and dialectical Greek, which can hardly have been acquired in any other way than by a sojourn of some length at Athens." Further, the reference in Cicero's Academica (II, xxxii. 102; cf. Oltramare, p. 92) to a book dedicated by the Academic philosopher

XUM

Clitomachus to Lucilius provides evidence that the two were acquainted and perhaps indicates that the Roman poet was a student of Clitomachus and perhaps also of Carneades, teacher of Clitomachus.[480] Perhaps Lucilius also came into contact with the diatribe in Athens, for, as will be shown later, his works shows evidence of possible familiarity with the genre. The poet's contact with philosophers was not limited to Greece, however, since he was a member of the famous Scipionic circle which included the Greek historian Polybius, a Stoic who believed that the purpose of history was to teach, not to entertain (cf. Fiske, p. 70), and the Stoic philosopher Panaetius of Rhodes, whose attitude toward the Cynic-Stoic diatribe has already been noted (see above after footnote 392). Panaetius' theories of style, which probably had some influence on Lucilius, included a preference for the dialogue form rather than the monologue (cf. Cicero, _de_ _Officiis_, I, 134) and the use of conversation, in a plain style, "...to reveal some defect in the speaker's (or writer's) own character..." (Fiske, pp. 86-87). Further, the Stoic philosopher seems to have advocated a mixture of humor and seriousness within the dialogue, by which he may have meant something approximating the Cynic _spoudaiogeloion_ (cf. Fiske, p. 88; Cicero, _de_ _Officiis_, I, 134, "ac videat in primis, quibus de rebus loquatur, si seriis, severitatem adhibeat, si iocosis, leporem...."), although with any excesses removed. Panaetius also seems to have mentioned topics suitable for a conversational style, for Cicero, following the views of Panaetius states in his _de_ _Officiis_ (I, 135), "habentur autem plerumque sermones aut de domesticis negotiis aut de re publica aut de artium studiis atque doctrina. danda igitur opera est, ut, etiamsi aberrare ad alia coeperit, ad haec revocetur oratio, sed utcumque aderunt; neque enim isdem de rebus nec omni tempore nec similiter delectamur."[481] The views of Panaetius and Polybius could have had some influence on any didactic tendency found in Lucilius' work and especially on his satires dealing with literary criticism or with rhetorical or grammatical problems.[482] As a possible example of the influence of Stoic rhetorical theory on Lucilius one may cite the following lines (Krenkel, fr. 182-189), preserved by Aulus Gellius (XVIII, 8.2), who introduces them with the comment that _homoeoteleuta_ are ridiculed in them (cf. footnote 548 below):

> quo me habeam pacto, tam etsi non quaeris, docebo
> quando in eo numero mansi, quo in maxima non est
> pars hominum...
> ut per<i>isse velis, quem visere nolueris, cum
> debueris. hoc 'nolueris' et 'debueris' te
> si minus delectat, quod atechnon et Eissocratium
> lerodesque simul totum ac sit meiraciodes,
> non operam perdo, si tu hic....

These lines indicate that Lucilius, while "...familiar with the technical figures..." of rhetoric (Fiske, p. 110), does recognize the absurdity of the abuse of the more obvious devices, which, of course, must have been disliked by Panaetius as too artificial for the plain style and as representing a desire to entertain rather than to teach. One cannot prove, of course, that the Roman poet was influenced by anything other than his own taste in his rejection of excessive ornamentation, but Stoic rhetorical theory, represented by Panaetius, Polybius, or the poet's own rhetorical training could have molded his taste. Further, the theories of Panaetius concerning the conversational style and its proper topics may have had some effect on the eventual form created by Lucilius for his satirical comments (cf. Fiske, p. 112 ff.) and given final form by Horace in his _sermones_, although any examination of the fragments of Lucilius must indicate that Panaetius and Stoic theory were not the only influences felt by the poet and that, indeed, Lucilius sometimes wrote using a form and discussing topics of which the Stoic

XUM

presumably would have disapproved (see, for example, fr. 541-547, Krenkel).

The discussion above has attempted to show that Lucilius would have been at least familiar with, if not well-versed in, the doctrines of the Academic and Stoic schools, which dealt not only with physical or ethical topics, but also with theories of literary criticism. In addition to his acquaintance with these doctrines the Roman poet also undoubtedly was familiar with Homer, with Hellenistic literature (on which see M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos*, Frankfurt a. m., 1949) and with the works of his Roman predecessors. Greek comedy also seems to have been read and absorbed by the poet, if Horace is correct in his remarks when he states (*Sermones*, I, iv. 1-8) that,

> Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae
> atque alii, quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,
> siquis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur,
> quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
> famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.
> hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus,
> mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque, facetus,
> emunctae naris, durus componere versus.[483]

Further, Lucilius seems to have known some of the poems of Archilochus. He himself writes (Krenkel, fr. 732)

> metuo ut fieri possit: ergo<anti>quo ab Archiloco excido,

a line which perhaps refers to Archilochus, fragment 74 (Diehl) and in fragment 720 (Krenkel),

> re in secunda tollere animos, in mala demittere,

may be imitating at least the thought of Archilochus' remark (fr. 66; *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, ed. E. Diehl, rev. R. Bulter, Teubner, 1952),

> ἓν δ'ἐπίσταμαι μέγα,
> τὸν κακῶς μ'ἔρδοντα δέννοις ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς.[484]

XUM

A connection between the works of Archilochus and Lucilius was recognized in antiquity, for the grammarian Diomedes, who seems to have been dependent on Varro (cf. Van Rooy, pp. 2 ff. and 138), states in his Ars Grammatica that "iambus est carmen maledicum...cuius carminis praecipui scriptores apud Graecos Archilochus et Hipponax, apud Romanos Lucilius..." (cf. Van Rooy, p. 138 and p. 143 notes 62 and 64).

All of these possible literary influences cannot be ignored in any study of Lucilius, but the possible influence of chief interest for this particular study is, of course, the diatribe, which must be considered as a possible source for themes as well as style. Outside of the fragments of the poet himself, one has evidence for the familiarity of Lucilius with the diatribe only in the comment "sunt autem disputationes Bionis philosophi quibus stultitiam vulgi arguit, cui paene consentiunt carmina Luciliana," found among the scholia to Horace's Epistulae II, ii. 60.[485] G. C. Fiske (p. 145) has stated concerning this comment that "without denying the possibility that these words might be taken in the more general sense of spiritual kinship between the Cynic philosophers and Lucilius, it seems to me more probable that they refer to more direct relationship in tone, method, and subject matter." The following discussion of the relationship between Lucilius and the diatribe will attempt to determine the validity of Fiske's opinion.

Within the fragments of the Roman poet occur, first of all, many of the traits characteristic of the diatribal style. Especially important are the parodies of Homer and of other poets, since parodies and poetic quotation are, as has been repeatedly stated, a common device used in the diatribe to

XUM

entertain and to instruct the listener. In the first book of Lucilius (fr. 6-55), for example, is found the description of a council of the gods "...hominum de rebus..." (Krenkel, fr. 6), which has been convened to decide the fate of the Romans (cf. Krenkel, p. 63) and which seems to be intended as a parody of similar scenes in Homer (cf. Fiske, p. 153; Oltramare, p. 92), such as that at the beginning of the *Odyssey* (I, 26 ff.) where the situation of Odysseus is discussed by Athens and Zeus (cf. Waszink in footnote 486). Lucilius' imitation seems to have gone beyond the simple adoption of a setting, however, for fragments 28-29 (Krenkel),

> ...ut contendere possem
> Thestiados Ledae atque Ixionies alochoeo,

which seem to have been spoken by Apollo (cf. Krenkel, p. 63; Fiske, p. 153), are intentionally reminiscent of the following Homeric line (*Iliad*, xiv. 317, ed. Munro and Allen, Oxford) spoken by Zeus to Hera:

> οὐδ᾽ ὁπότ᾽ ἠρασάμην Ἰξιονίης ἀλόχοιο....[486]

If Apollo is the speaker of the Lucilian line, then the poet not only has parodied a Homeric line but also has created for the knowledgeable reader a humorous situation in which a son of Zeus throws at his father a line originally spoken by Zeus in a situation in which he was being tricked by his wife. Additional Homeric parodies are found in other fragments of the Roman poet. For instance, fragment 1261 (Krenkel),

> ...ore salem expiravit amarum,

probably is intended to remind the reader of the following passage which describes the struggles of Odysseus after he left Calypso's island and encountered a storm sent by Poseidon (*Odyssey*, V, 322; ed. P. von der Mühll, Editiones Helveticae, Basil, 1962):

...στόματος δ' ἐξέπτυσεν ἅλμην
πικρήν, ἣ οἱ πολλὴ ἀπὸ κρατὸς κελάρυζεν.[487]

A slightly different type of parody involving only a few words is found in the rather brutal remarks (Krenkel, fr. 541-547),

num censes calliplocamon callisphyron ullam
non licitum esse uterum atque etiam inguina
        tangere mammis,
conpernem aut variam fuisse Amphitryonis acoetin
Alcmenam, atque alias, <He>lenam ipsam denique - nolo
dicere: tute vide atque disyllabon elige quodvis -
<κού>ρην eupatereiam aliquam rem insignem habuisse,
verrucam, naevum, punctum, dentem eminulum unum?

In this text the words "...Amphitryoris acoetin Alcmenam..." are an apparent reference to the following lines, from the *Nekyia* section of the *Odyssey* (XI, 266; cited by Krenkel, I, p. 317):

τὴν δὲ μετ' Ἀλκμήνην ἴδον, Ἀμφιτρύωνος ἄκοιτιν.

Further, the "modest" allusion to Helen followed by the words "...<κού>ρην eupatereiam..." provides a reference to a the word "εὐπατερέιαν," applied by Homer to Helen in both epics (Iliad, vi, 293; Odyssey, XXII, 227, cf. Odyssey xi, 235 for application to Tyro; cf. Krenkel, pp. 317 and 319 for these references). The insertion of such allusions does not make these lines a parody, but rather, as was the case in one passage of the *de Ira* of Philodemus (col. VIII, 15 ff.; see discussion of Philodemus above), serves to create humor through incongruity. Since epic phrases obviously are inconsistent with the specific criticisms voiced by the poet, the listener is struck and amused by their use and therefore tends to remember the poet's message. One must note here the further possibility that this entire passage was intended not only to ridicule the idealized descriptions of women found in various forms of literature,[488] and especially in love poetry, but also Homeric descriptions

XUM

such as that of the daughter of Chryses , whom Agamemnon describes as (Iliad, I, 114-115),

...ἐπεὶ οὔ ἐθέν ἐστι χερείων,
οὐ δέμαςοὐδὲ φυήν, οὔτ᾽ἂρ φρένας οὔτε τι ἔργα,

or the description of Briseis as she mourned Patrocles (Iliad, xix, 284-285), or the various references to the beauty of Helen. Other Homeric parodies by Lucilius could be mentioned here (cf. Fiske, pp. 154-155 and p. 211, note 44), but the passages which have been discussed should be sufficient to illustrate the Roman poet's method.

Lucilius, however, does not confine his parodies to Homeric texts, for he also seems to have mimicked verses from the tragedies of Pacuvius, opposing to lines such as (Pacuvius, fr. 13-14, Warmington, II),

...illuvie corporis
et coma prolixa impexa conglomerate atque horrida...,

his equally wordy imitation (Krenkel, fr. 605-606; cf. Oltramare, p. 92),

squalitate summa ac scabie, summa in aerumna,
obrutam,
neque inimicis invidiosam, neque amico exoptabilem....

Further, the poet Accius does not seem to have escaped critical imitation by Lucilius, for the scoliast Porphyrion, commenting on Horace, Sermones I, x. 53,

nil comis tragici mutat Lucilius Acci?...,

states, "facit autem haec Lucilius cum alias tum vel maxime in tertio libro, meminit VIII et X....".[489] Criticism of Accius is not limited to his poetry, however, for Lucilius also attacks the grammatical views of the tragedian who, according to Terentius Scaurus (Krenkel, fr. 343), "...geminatis vocalibus scribi natura longas syllabas voluit...".[490] Further, in the verse (Krenkel, fr. 747) quare pro facie, pro statura Accius...,

the satirist ridicules Accius himself who, although a man of short stature, had had a tall statue of himself erected.[491] A third Roman poet parodied and criticized by Lucilius is Ennius, as Horace informs the reader in the following lines (Sermones I, x. 54-55) which concern Lucilius:

non ridet versus Enni gravitate minores,
cum de se loquitur non ut maiore reprensis?[492]

One example of such ridicule is preserved by Servius, who, commenting on the words "...horret ager..." in the Aeneid, XI, 602, writes (Krenkel, fr. 1210), "'horret ager,' terribilis est. est autem versus Ennianus, vituperatus a Lucilio dicente per inrisionem debuisse eum dicere -

...horret et - alget."

Examination of the parodies noted above and the information concerning them which has been preserved by various later authors indicates that the purpose for which Lucilius used the device varied and often was not in keeping with the diatribal practice of using parodies to illustrate an ethical point through humor. The imitations and criticisms of Accius, Ennius, and Pacuvius, for instance, with the exception of the remark concerning Accius' statue, seem to be intended as literary criticism, fulfilling the same purpose as that of the "...contemporary critical reviews of the type so common in England in the first half of the nineteenth century..." (Fiske, pp. 47-48, on parody). The lines most obviously involved in literary criticism, of course, are those directed not against the style of any of the three poets but those critical of Accius' theories of spelling, which must be considered a part of literary criticism and which may represent an interest developed by Lucilius in his contact with the Stoic Panaetius, a representative of a school especially interested in grammatical theory.[493] In the other fragments mentioned, and especially in those dealing with Pacuvius, stylistic criticism is evident and must have been a source of humor for those among Lucilius' readers or auditors who knew the sections of the plays which were being imitated. Whether any of these parodies served a second purpose, namely that of poetic illustrations, cannot be determined, but seems unlikely, for, if the statements of Porphyrion and other commentators are trustworthy, then Lucilius seems to have devoted entire satires to such critical parodies, a fact which does not exclude the possibility that he could have included similar parodies, for the sake of humor, within satires on other themes.

In contrast to his parodies of Latin poets, Lucilius' Homeric parodies, while probably also intended as literary criticism,[494] seem to be employed occasionally as a means of presenting social criticism mixed with humor, a method reminiscent of Cynic spoudaiogeloion. Prime examples of this tendency are the passage dealing with the council of the gods (fr. 6-55) and the comments on the physical defects of women (fr. 541-547). In the discussion conducted by the gods in council, for instance, one of the gods, probably Romulus (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 63), complains about luxury at Rome and mentions (Krenkel, fr. 14 and 15; cf. Oltramare, p. 94),

> praetextae ac tunicae: Lydorum opus sordidu<lu>m omne
>
> . . . .
>
> psilae atque amphitapi villis ingentibus molles....

Romulus' complaint, of course, may reflect the diatribal exhortations against excessive luxury (cf. Oltramare, p. 94 and p. 51, themes 35 ff.), although Lucilius' own observations could have resulted in his composition of these lines. Another observation concerning human foibles is expressed by Apollo and seems to represent the poet's amusement at the practice of using the epithet "pater" for various gods instead of for only one. Thus, in fragments 23-26 (Krenkel), Apollo comments,

> . . . . .ut
> nemo sit nostrum quin aut pater optimus divum,
> aut Neptunus pater, Liber Saturnus pater, Mars
> Ianus Quirinus pater siet ae dicatur ad unum....[495]

In addition to such general complaints one finds remarks, such as (Krenkel, fr. 38),

> vultus item ut facies: mors, icterus morbus, venenum,

which apparently are directed against one Lupus who seems to have been the primary target of the satire and who finally is warned (Krenkel, fr. 55),

> occidunt, Lupe, saperdae te et iura siluri.

The use of parody, the humor inherent in the contrast of the insignificant Lupus with the epic council, and the attack on luxury and presumably on other faults of society, revealing a serious intent beneath all of the humor, could be indicative of diatribal influence, although at least two other possible sources of inspiration must be considered. First, it is possibl that Lucilius knew the Silloi of Timon of Phlius,[496] which Fiske (p. 153) has described as "...parodies in hexameter, in which Homeric verses were deftly employed to parody the Homeric Νεκυία...," and that the Roman poet was influenced by them in his choice of meter (Fiske, p. 155) and also in his use of Homeric parody to attack both general and particular social ills. A second, and very likely, source of inspiration is Attic Old Comedy, for, in the description of the council of the gods and in the attack on one specific person, one can see a basic similarity to plays such as Aristophanes' Aves and Ranae with their satiric representations of Heracles and Dionysos and their attacks on Athenian political figures and playwrights. Possibly then, in the case of a satire such as the one involving the council of the gods, one should be

XUM

hesitant to assume diatribal influence and instead should accept the judgement of Horace (*Sermones*, I, iv. 1-8, quoted above at footnote 483) that Lucilius was influenced strongly by Attic Old Comedy.

A second satire which contains not only parody but also possible social commentary is that in which there appears the passage concerning physical defects of women (Krenkel, fr. 541-547, quoted above) and which seems to have dealt in part with Penelope in the absense of Ulysses (cf. Krenkel, fr. 539-540 and Warmington, III, fr. 565-566).[497] Underlying Lucilius' sarcastic warning that noble birth cannot guarantee physical perfection in women may be some diatribal attack on the dangers of love and adultery and on the benefits attached to the concept paraphrased by Oltramare (p. 50, theme 32) as "il faut *satisfaire nos besoins sexuels aussi simplement que possible*." One should add here the remark of Diogenes of Sinope, who stated that (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 61; Oltramare, p. 50, theme 32b) "τὰς εὐπρεπεῖς ἑταίρας...Θανασίμῳ μελικράτῳ παραπλησίας εἶναι." Further, Antisthenes once urged, perhaps, as Oltramare thinks (p. 5), theme 32c), in reference to "...prostituées les plus humbles," that (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 3; Oltramare, p. 51), "...χρὴ τοιαύταις πλησιάζειν γυναιξίν αἳ χάριν εἴσονται." If any of these themes are involved in Lucilius' remarks or in the satire from which they were taken, then the Roman poet's use of Homeric parody must be seen as especially effective because of its high style in contrast with a low subject. On the basis of this one passage, however, one cannot prove that any of the diatribal topics mentioned were included in the Roman poet's satire, nor can one assume that the remainder of the poem continued in the same vein and perhaps was developed along the same lines as the section in Lucretius (IV, 1152 ff.) which concerns the inability of the lover to recognize faults in his mistress. The frank tone and language of the text would seem to be a more definite sign of diatribal influence than any themes are, especially since such frankness is criticized by Panaetius (see above after footnote 392) as a specific trait of Cynic-Stoic writings. Further, one could argue that the notion that famous women such as Helen and Alcmene could have been less than physically perfect (cf. footnote 497) represents a form of rationalization of mythology similar to that found in, but not limited to, Cynic works (see above at footnote 346 and following). The possibility of diatribal influence on this Lucilian satire, then, should not be ignored, but neither should one eliminate the possibilities that this influence came at second hand through a Hellenistic poet or that Lucilius himself, aware of the Cynic parrhesia and spoudaiogeloion, applied them to a theme and parody of his own creation, possibly in an attack on sentimentality in literature or in society.

In addition to the parodies of lines from epic and tragic poetry which have been mentioned, the Roman poet includes within his satires imitations of scenes from the comedies of Terence and Caeciluis (cf. Krenkel, I, pp. 93-94 and fro. 852-53 ff.) which serve the double purpose of providing both literary criticism and humor. One of these Terentian imitations already has been mentioned above in the discussion of Horace, Sermones II, 3. 259-271 (see above at footnote 424). As a second example one may cite the fourth satire of book 29 in which Lucilius seems to have parodied Terence's Eunuchus, IV, vii, where the soldier Thraso, along with his parasite Gnatho and an army composed of three slaves, make a comic attempt to storm the house of the meretrix Thais (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 96). A comparison of the fragments of Lucilius with the scene from Terence indicates that the satirist reworked his model thoroughly. Lines such as (Krenkel; fr. 913) 'caede ostium, Gnatho, urge' - 'restant: periimus',

and (Krenkel, fr. 914)

'crus lapide? nihil est' - 'credam, si te offenderit',

as alll as (Krenkel, fr. 915),

'Gnatho, quid actum est?' - 'depilate omnes sumus,'

seem to indicate that Lucilius retained not only the name of one character, but also the comic absurdity of the situation which features the cowardly Thraso, who pretends to be a great and brave warrior and yet who is unable to storm a house defended only by his mistress, her servants, and her visitor Chremes. The fragments which survive do not allow one to assume that Lucilius intended his parody to express a moral or that he followed a method of the diatribe in placing a comic scene within his satire (cf. Fiske, p. 394), although one should not discount these possibiltties entirely.

Lucilius does not limit his use of other poets to imitations of their work, however, for there appear in his satires poetic quotations and mythological references which are inserted into a discussion for purposes of illustration or of ornamentation. For example the following lines (Krenkel, fr. 464-465), which probably reflect the poet's attitude toward his own work and readers (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 285 and Puelma Piwonka, p. 80), include a quotation from the Odyssey (xi, 491):

non paucis malle ac 'sapientibus' esse probatum
ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.

The Homeric line not only illustrates Lucilius' view much more elegantly than could a simple expression of opinion but also captures the reader's attention through the use of hyperbole.[498] A second noteworthy quotation appears in the poem upon which Horace seems to have modelled his famous satire concerning a tenacious bore (*Sermones*, I, 9).[499] Within, and possibly at the conclusion of, the first satire of book VI, which seems to have described the chance meeting of Scipio Aemilianus and an importunate bore, Lucilius writes (Warmington, III, fr. 267-268,

> nil ut discrepet ac τὸν δ'ἐξήρπαξεν 'Απόλλων
> fiat...,

inserting the epic phrase (*Iliad*, XX, 443; cf. Warmington, III, p. 82, footnote) in an obvious attempt to create humor through the contrast of the position of Scipio and that of Hector, whom Apollo temporarily saved from Achilles in the Homeric passage. Apparently other sections of this same satire were written in a high style to create humor through parody of the epic style. Fragments 262-3, for example, are notable for their epic diction, as they apparently describe the bore (Warmington, III, p. 82; cf. Fiske, p. 332),

> quem neque Lucanis oriundi montibus tauri
> ducere protelo validis cervicibus possent.

Both of the quotations which have been cited here conform to the diatribal practice of inserting such quotations within a sentence or a paragraph without interrupting the flow of the argument and often without mention of the poet who composed the verses.[500] One cannot assume, however, that only the diatribe followed this practice, and therefore cannot determine whether Lucilius' method in using these quotations is definitely indicative of diatribal influence, although it may well be.

Also possibly related to the diatribe is Lucilius' use of references to mythological figures. One of these references already has been discussed above in the section on Homeric parodies (see above after footnote 497). A second important reference is that to Tantalus found in the verses (Krenkel, fr. 142-143),

> Tantalus, qui poenas - ob facta nefantia poenas
> pendit..........

Concerning this text Oltramare (p. 92, note 4) observes that "le mythe de Tantale est utilisé suivant l'habitude diatribique...," and he refers (p. 62, note 1) to the following passage from Teles (p. 34. 9 ff.):

> καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ Τάνταλος ἐν λίμνῃ ἕστηκεν, ὥς φησιν ὁ
> ποιητής, κατὰ κρατὸς δὲ καρποί,
> ἀλλ᾽ ὁπότ᾽ ἰθύσει᾽ ὁ γέρων
> πιεῖν ἢ τῶν καρπῶν ἅψασθαι, ἡ μὲν λίμνη ξηρὰ ἐγίνετο,
> τοὺς δ᾽ ἄνεμος ῥίπτασκε ποτὶ νέφεα σκιόεντα,
> οὕτως ἐνίων ἡ ἀνελευθερία καὶ δυσελπιστία καὶ τὸν
> οἶνον καὶ τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὴν ὀπώραν ῥίπτασκεν, οὐ ποτὶ
> νέφεα ἀλλ᾽ ἃ μὲν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἃ δὲ εἰς τὸ
> καπηλεῖον, καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντες οὐδενὸς γεύονται.

Tantalus here is used to illustrate the concept that "le _désir_ _est_ _un_ _mal_..." (Oltramare, p. 62, theme 78) and, as "...a type of the insatiable craving of man...," already has the role of "...a stock Cynic figure to symbolize the helpless victim of some passion..." (Fiske, pp. 200-201) which he assumes in later literature.[501] The Lucilian fragment in which the reference to Tantalus appears seems to have been part of a satire concerned with journey by the Roman poet which influenced Horace in his satire concerning a journey to Brundisium (cf. Krenkel, I, pp. 65-66; Horace, _Serm._, I, 5; Fiske, pp. 306 ff.). Through a comparison of the fragments of this satire by Lucilius with the account given by Horace, and especially with lines 82-85 of the Horatian poem, Krenkel (I, p. 157) and, Fiske (pp. 310-311) have concluded that Lucilius' reference to Tantalus may refer to "...the tortures suffered by Lucilius while waiting in vain for the appearance of the girl..." with whom he has arranged a tryst.[502] A second possible interpretation is that offerred by Warmington (III, p. 45), who suggests that the fragment may refer to "trouble after eating and drinking too well....". Both of these interpretations are plausible, and either fits into the framework of a description of the poet's travels and also adheres to the use of Tantalus as an example of desire which leads to suffering. Either interpretation, then, can lead one to the conclusion that Lucilius could have followed a Cynic work, possibly a diatribe, when he decided to use Tantalus as an example. One, however, cannot ignore the possibility that Lucilius merely was employing a well-known mythological figure whose story and fate had become a commonplace in literature or that he was drawing on the work of Timon of Phlius (see above at footnote 496), whose Homeric parodies included a Nekyia in which Tantalus probably would have been mentioned. At the root of any other source, however, could have been a Cynic commonplace developed in a diatribe or possibly in the Nekyia of Menippus of Gadara. Thus, one probably should assume that the reference to Tantalus in Lucilius is connected, either directly or indirectly, with the Cynic tradition.

Lucilius seems to have been fond of using mythological figures, such as Tantalus, in an allegorical or symbolic fashion to provide an apt description of some person or to add humor. For example, an old man with a bad cough is described as Tiresias in the lines (Krenkel, fr. 1118-1119; cf. Warmington, III, fr. 228-229),

> ante fores autem et triclini limina quidam
> perditus Tiresias tussi grandaevus gemebat.

An additional example is provided by the remark (Krenkel, fr. 175-176),

> Tisiphone Tityi e pulmonibus atque adipe unguen
> excoctum attulit, Eumenidum sanctissima Erinys,

which seems to refer to an unappealing dish (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 169; Warmington, III, fr. 162-3) presumably served by an equally unappealing woman. Perhaps also fitting into this category is the question (Krenkel, fr. 296-297),

> huncin ego umquam Hyacintho hominem, cortinipotentis
> deliciis, contendi?....

Each of these mythological examples conforms to the definition of the rhetorical figure *permutatio* or *allegoria* which is (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xxxiv. 46, and note b) an "...oratio aliud verbis aliud sententia demonstraus..." which "...dividitur in tres partes: similitudinem, argumentum, contrarium. "In the Lucilian references to Tantalus, Tiresias, Tisiphone, and Hyacinth the figure is constructed through similarities, following a pattern similar to the question, "Quid ait hic rex atque Agamemnon noster, sive, ut crudelitas est, potius Atreus?," which is the example of *permutatio* "...a similitudine..." given by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Perhaps, then, Lucitius' rhetorical training was influential on his use of these examples, although similar allegories must have appeared in the Greek literature known to the poet and perhaps also in the diatribe. A prime example of the use of this figure in Hellenistic literature, of course, is Callimachus' famous remark (*Aetia*, I, i.1-2, ed. R. Pfeiffer, Oxford, I, 1948),

> Οἶδ' ὅτ]ι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῇ,
> νήιδες οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι,

in which he refers to his critics as the Telchines. Diogenes of Sinope also may have used the figure, for Diogenes Laertius reports (VI, 51) concerning the Cynic that, "τὴν γαστέρα χάρυβδιν ἔλεγε τοῦ βίου...," a remark which could be an example of permutatio but which also could represent the use of metonymy, depending upon what the actual words of Diogenes were.[503]

In addition to parodies, quotations, and mythological references Lucilius seems to have included within his poems complete fables, as well as brief references to fables. In book 30 of his satires, for example, is found the fable of the sick lion (Krenkel, fr. 1074-1083) who, after he has provided food for himself by enticing various animals into his den, tries and fails to convince a fox to enter. The fox, who has judged the situation correctly, merely asks (Krenkel, fr. 1082-1083),

> quid sibi vult, quare fit, ut intro vorsus et ad te
> spectant atque ferant vestigia se omnia prorsus?[504]

Interpretations of this fable vary. Oltramare considers the story an example of the Cynic theme "l'amour passionné est un mal..." (p. 63, theme 87; cf. p. 92 footnote 6), but he gives no reason for his opinion. Apparently Puelma Piwonka supports a similar interpretation, for he refers (p. 157) to the "...Hetären- und Bordellabenteuer, deren Illustration offenbar das Gleichnis von der Höhle des Löwen...gilt,....". One easily can see, of course, that a moralist could use this fable as an illustration of the dangers inherent in becoming involved in an affair with a courtesan whose wiles eventually could destroy a young man. If Lucilius did have this interpretation in mind and if he inserted this fable within a satire concerning love, then the Roman poet was using a diatribal theme and method and presumably was influenced directly by one or more Cynic-Stoic diatribes. Another possible interpretation suggested by Krenkel (I, p. 102) removes the diatribal theme but leaves intact the method of inserting an illustrative fable within an argument. Possibly relying on

XUM

the use of the same story by Horace (Epistulae, I, i. 73 ff.) to describe the loss of "...personal independence of judgement on the part of those who have yielded to the unthinking judgement of the crowd..." (Fiske, p. 428), Krenkel groups the fragments containing the fable with others (1068-1109) to form what he describes as a "literarische Polemik" (I, p. 102).[505] The fragmentary state of the fable and of all of Lucilius' work does not allow one to declare that either of the two interpretations is more valid, although the use of the fable by Horace could reflect the original Lucilian usage and point to an interpretation concerned with intellect rather than with passion. Since Oltramare, Puelma Piwonka, and Krenkel all seem to agree, with good reasons, that the fable formed only part of a satire and not the whole, then one may be justified in assuming that Lucilius was influenced here by the diatribe in his method of including a fable as an illustration of other points within his poem.[506] One should note here, however, that the diatribe was not alone in its use of the fable as only part of a larger argument (see above after footnote 465), and that special attention should be paid to the fourth Iambus of Callimachus (fr. 194, Pfeiffer; cf. van Rooy, p. 36 on this fragment and Ennius) in which the Greek poet uses a fable concerning an olive tree and a laurel to attack one Simos, the son of Charitades, who has (according to the comments on this poem in the Diegesis) interrupted an argument between Callimachus and another man, and who thus has made the mistake of considering himself the equal of the two disputants. In the inclusion by Callimachus of a fable within the framework of the situation just mentioned and the use of that device as an attack on an impudent fellow can be seen a possible model for Lucilius in his use of the fable of the sick lion and the fox, if indeed the tale was used within the framework of another story or argument and if the poet's purpose was a polemic one. One, therefore, must make allowances for influences other than the diatribe, but at the same time one should not exclude the possibility that a Cynic source did inspire Lucilius in his use of this fable.

The other possible references to fables in Lucilius (cf. Fiske, p. 167; Krenkel, fr. 200, 221, 535, 647, 959) offer varying degrees of help in determining sources of inspiration. Especially interesting are the lines (Krenkel, fr. 564-565),

> sic tu illos fructus quaeras, adversa hieme olim
> quis uti possis ac dectare domi te,

which seem to be the conclusion of the same fable concerning the industrious ant which was used by Horace, in Sermones I, 1. 33 ff., who contrasts, as Fiske has noted (p. 231), "...the impelling force of avarice, which will brave all obstacles, whether imposed by man or nature, in the pursuit of gain, with the natural industry of the ant, which after the period of acquisition in the summer time wisely remains at home to enjoy her store in the winter....". The presence of the remarks (Krenkel, fr. 566-67),

> 'aurum vis hominem<ne>? habeas.' - 'hominem? quid ad aurum?
> quare ut dicimus, non video hic quid magno opere optem?

within the same Lucilian satire[507] (in book XIX) would seem to support the idea that avarice or cupidity is involved in this satire. Further, the exhortation (Krenkel, fr. 558),

> sume diem, qui est visus tibi pulcherrimus unus,

and the comment (Krenkel, fr. 559),

> sic singillatim nostrum unus quisque movetur,

which seem to deal with "...the theme of contentment with one's lot..." (Warmington, III, p. 182, note a), would be compatible with the fable of the

XUM

ant who, in contrast with the miser, takes and enjoys only what it needs. Krenkel (I, p. 80) and Fiske (pp. 231 ff.) would seem to be correct, then, in assuming that these two fragments belong to the same satire as does the fable and the Lucilius, like Horace in Sermones, I, i, as Fiske observes (p. 230), "...contaminated the two related themes of μεμψιμοιρία and φιλοπλουτία, doubtlessly as the result of his familiarity with these two related commonplaces in the pages of Bion and other popular Greek preachers of philosophy."[508] The presence of the two Cynic themes mentioned by Fiske and the apparent employment of a fable as an illustration within the argument of a satire which may have influenced Horace (cf. Fiske, pp. 246-247) provide a strong link between Lucilius and the diatribal tradition and seem to indicate that he was influenced by the work of Bion and Teles or of other Cynics in his composition of this satire.

Another device frequently used to illustrate a point in the diatribe and in the satires of Lucilius is the comparison involving a situation with which the reader is likely to be familiar. Rather common in the diatribe and in literature related to it (see above at footnotes 298 and 300), for example, are similes drawn from the field of medicine, such as Bion's famous remarks concerning the man ill with dropy (see above after footnote 300, and Fiske, p. 184). Oltramare comments (p. 92) that Lucilius also used such comparisons, and he cites as examples fragment 7 (Krenkel),

> serpere uti gangraena mala atque herpestica posset,

which he correctly sees as an example of the theme (theme 74b, p. 61), "le vice est une maladie...," and fragment 664 (Krenkel),

> nequam prius quam venas hominis tetigit ac praecordia,

in which the theme (theme 74c, p. 60), "le sage est un médecin..." is

XUM

apparent, especially when one considers this fragment in terms of the others within the satire. Other medical reference occur within this same poem and should be classed as parallels drawn between medicine and philosophy. The following fragments (Krenkel, fr. 659, 660-661, 662) seem to illustrate the same close connection between the maladies of the soul and those of the body which one finds later in Philodemus' de Ira (see above in section D) which was influenced by both Bion and the Stoic Chrysippus (see above at footnote 284):

> tum doloribus confectum corpus animo obsistere
> . . . .
> principio physici omnes constare hominem exanima et corpore
> dicunt. . . . . .
> . . . .
> animo qui aegrotat, videmus corpore hunc signum dare.

Perhaps Lucilius followed the diatribal themes concerning evil as a sickness and the sage as a healer (Oltramare, p. 61 as cited above) throughout the fourth satire of book XXVI, from which these fragments are taken and even in the sections concerning the physical manifestations of illness (Krenkel, fr. 665 ff.) was creating a metaphor dealing with the illness of the soul. Even if he, drew parallels between spiritual and physical illness only at the beginning of his satire and then progressed into a mundane description of a purely physical illness (which seems unlikely), the poet still has employed topics which seem to connect him with the diatribal tradition, although one cannot ignore the possibility that the de Ira of the Stoic Chrysippus also discussed physical and spiritual parallels and influenced Lucilius through Panaetius or independently.[509] One should note concerning this satire, incidentally, that some of its lines which deal with the bodily functions of the sick man must be considered at variance with Panaetius' theories concerning τὸ πρέπον (see above after footnote 392) and indicate that Lucilius followed his own inclinations whenever he wished and was not necessarily a firm adherent of the Stoic's stylistic canons (see above after footnote 482).

In addition to medical comparisons in the satires of Lucilius, similes and metaphors derived from common knowledge and experiences often are used either to illustrate a point or to provide humor.[510] Similes involving animals are rather common and provide the most graphic comparisons. For example, both humor and disgust are evident in the remark (Krenkel, fr. 331),

> scaberat ut porcus contritis arbore costis,

in which the poet seems to compare an old man scratching his back against a wall (Krenkel, I, p. 72) to a pig rubbing its sides against a tree. Equally explicit is the comparison of a large man to the dogs of butchers, found in the verse (Krenkel, fr. 1245),

> nequam et magnus homo, laniorum immanis canes ut.

In addition to these two similes one finds the following lively exchange between a girl and her admirer (cf. Warmington, III, p. 339) which includes a comparison of the girl to an untamed filly (Krenkel, fr. 985-986 and 987-988):

> . . . an<ne>ego te vacuam atque animosam,
> Tessalam ut indomitam, frenis subigamque domemque?
> . . . .
> tune iugo iungas me? anne et succedere aratro
> invitam et glebas subigas proscindere ferro?[511]

A horse appears also in a simile which, in an epic tone, compares a swift horse with a ship that is hurried along by the force of the water (Krenkel, fr. 320-321). A less friendly animal makes his appearance in the following verses which deal with a man about to burst (figuratively) with anger or laughter (Krenkel, Ibid; Warmington, III, p. 191):

> iam disrumpetur medius, iam, ut Marsus colubras
> disrumpit cantu, venas cum extenderit omnis.[512]

In addition to these similes concerning animals, one finds others which deal with familiar occupations, situations, or objects. The mindless greed of a parasite, for example, is compared in the following lines to the cook's lack of appreciation of the beauty of a peacock which he is preparing (Krenkel, fr. 691-692):

> cocus non curat cauda insignem esse illam, dum
> pinguis siet:
> sic amici quaerunt animum, rem parasiti ac
> ditias.

This simile, of course, is an excellent example of spoudaiogeloion, for it offers a serious point in the guise of a mildly humorous comparison. Other references to occupations are not humorous but rather seem to have an epic tone. The verses (Krenkel, 1185-86),

> et velut in fabrica fervens cum marculus ferrum
> <Mulcibero>multo, cum magnis ictibus tundit,

with their alliteration, possible use of metonymy in the adjective "Mulcibero," and exaggeration of the force of the hammer blows, could have been part of a serious descriptive simile or even have formed part of an epic parody. Another, apparently serious, descriptive simile taken from the same realm appears in the satire concerned with Lucilius' travels (book 3) and depicts the sparks coming from Mt. Stromboli (Krenkel, I, p. 159; Warmington, III, p. 47) by noting that they are (Krenkel, fr. 146-147)

> crebrae ut scintillae, in stricturis quod genus olim
> ferventi fero....

To these similes must be added the references to acrobats (Krenkel, fr. 1314) and to a fowler (Krenkel, fr. 1336) which can be assigned to no particular satire, but which provide two other examples of the poet's use of well-known activities as a source for his comparisons.[513] One final simile deserves mention here because of its reference to a very mundane object and because of the apparent venom of its attack. In the fifth satire of book 30 which seems to be a literary polemic (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 102 and above at footnote 505 and following) Lucilius contemptuously refers to his opponent as (Krenkel, fr. 1069-1070),

> hic ut muscipulae tentae atque ut scorpios cauda
> sublata....

One cannot avoid noticing the scornful humor created when the poet groups together the set mousetrap and the dangerous scorpion as equal menaces and as representatives of the danger created by the man with whom they are compared.[514]

Additional comparisons could be cited, but those which have been mentioned are sufficient indicators of the poet's tendency to fashion comparisons based on objects or situations which are familiar to the reader and therefore easily understood. As has been noted above (see at footnote 100 and following), the use of similes involving familiar experiences and aspects of daily life are a common feature of the diatribal style, and, if found in connection with Cynic themes, may be taken as evidence of the influence of the diatribe on the writer who employs them. None of the Lucilian similes which have been mentioned in this study, however, with the possible exception of those involving medicine (see above at footnote 509), involve themes which can be traced definitely to the Cynic philosophy. Possibly the simile concerning the man about to burst like a snake could be related to diatribal themes concerning the ascetic life (cf. Oltramare, p. 56, themes 52b and 52d) and the avoidance of gluttony (cf. Oltramare, p. 50, themes 31, 31a, and especially 31b, "Comme Circe, *la gloutonnerie* metamorphose les hommes en brutes."), or concerning the control of the emotions (cf. Oltramare, p. 45, theme 11, and Teles, pp. 55~~ ff.~~), depending upon the interpretation that one assigns to this fragment (see above at footnote 512). Further, the comparison of a man scratching his back to a pig rubbing its sides against a tree (Krenkel, fr. 331) is not lacking in spoudaiogeloion and certainly features the same type of homeliness as that found in Bion's simile concerning the proper way to hold a snake (Teles, p. 9, 2 ff.; see above at footnote 102) or in the remark of Diogenes of Sinope, who, when, according to one legend, he was being sold as a slave and was ordered not to sit down, said (Diogenes Prasis), "'οὐδέν...διαφέρει·καὶ γὰρ τοὺς ἰχθῦς ὅπως ἂν κέοιντο πιπράσκεσθαι.'"[515] Thus, while one cannot prove that either of these similes derives from a Cynic source, one must admit the possibility that the theme of the one and the nature and tone of the other could be indicative of diatribal influence. Also not to be excluded is influence stemming from the literary theories of Panaetius, for most of the similes which have been mentioned, since they deal with topics of an ordinary sort, conform to the Stoic's list of themes appropriate for the conversational style (see above at footnote 481). The poet Lucilius, however, must not be considered devoid of the capacity to observe his environment and to create similes based only on his own experiences or knowledge, and one, therefore, while acknowledging the possibilities of influences from Cynic, Stoic, or traditional poetic sources, should not attempt to link every simile to something beyond the poet's own inspiration.

To the use of comparisons to illustrate a point ot to create humor must be added the device known as characterismos (see above at footnote 90) which often serves both of these purposes (cf. Fiske, p. 186 on spoudaiogeloion and the character sketch). A prime example of this device is the characterization of the bore whom Scipio Aemilianus encountered (Warmington, III, fr. 254-268) and who formed a model for Horace's famous bore (Serm., I, 9; see above at footnote 499). Although little remains of the Lucilian satire in which the bore appeared, one can see in the following lines (Warmington, III, fr. 262-3) the humor which must have been evident in the entire description:

> quem neque Lucanis oriundi montibus tauri
> ducere protelo validis cervicibus possent.

Other passages probably described a character who like Theophrastus' *adolesches* (Diels, III, 1.2-3) would try to converse at length on intimate terms even with total strangers and thus make a nuisance of himself.[516] Lucilius, probably was influenced in his sketch of the bore by the *Characteres* of Theophrastus (cf. footnote 516) or by those written by later Peripatetics,[517] although the rhetorical practice of character description within a speech, known as *notatio* or *ethopoiia* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium,* IV, xlix. 63 and note d), also could have been a source of inspiration for the poet, who might have practiced such sketches as a student and in that way have derived material from the Peripatetic sketches at second hand. A sketch more complete than that of the bore is the description of the superstitious man, concerning whom Lucilius writes (Krenkel, fr. 490-495),

> terriculas, Lamias, Fauni quas Pompiliique
> instituere Numae, tremit has, hic omnia ponit.
> ut pueri infantes credunt signa omnia aena
> vivere et esse homines, sic isti somnia ficta
> vera putant, credunt signis cor inesse in aenis:
> pergula pictorum, veri nihil, omnia ficta.[518]

Possibly this description represents a development of Theophrastus' definition of *deisidaimonia* as "...δειλία πρὸς τὸ δαιμόνιον..." (Diels, XVI, 1.1-2), although fear of the statues of the gods is not included by the Peripatetic as a trait found in the *deisidaimon*. A more likely source for the views expressed by Lucilius here is a Cynic or Stoic diatribe, since attacks on superstition and religion were common topics of the genre (cf. Oltramare, p. 96 and his themes 92-94, pp. 64-65 dealing with superstition).[519] For example, if one can trust the obviously hostile source used by Diogenes Laertius (see footnote 77 and Hense, "Prolegomena," in Teles, p. lviii ff.; cf. D. R. Dudley, p. 64), Bion himself (D. L. IV, 54), "πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἀθεώτερον προεφέρετο τοῖς ὁμιλοῦσι, τοῦτο Θεοδώρειον ἀπολαύσας." Diogenes Laertius supplements his account of Bion's anti-religious views with a poem in which he speaks of Bion as,

> ὁ μὴ θεοὺς εἶναι λέγων, ὁ νηὸν οὐδὲ βλέψας,
> ὁ πολλὰ χλευάσα βροτούς, ὅσοι θεοῖς ἔθυον...,

and claims that the Borysthenite became fearful of the gods before his death. A statement apparently critical of supersitition also is recorded by Teles, who preserves Bion's famous simile comparing giving money to a greedy man with giving water to a man ill with dropsy (see above in section D, cf. Fiske, p. 184; cf. apparatus in Teles, p. 39) which concludes with the remark (Teles, p. 39.5 ff.), "ἐκεῖνός τε γὰρ ἂν πρότερον πίνων διαρραγείη ἢ παύσαιτο τοῦ δίψους, οὗτός τε οὐκ ἂν ποθ᾽ ἱκανωθείη, ὅταν ᾖ ἄπληστος καὶ δοξοκόπος καὶ δεισιδαίμων." Superstition is mentioned again by Teles, in connection with wealth, in the observation (Teles, p. 41.15-42.1), "ὅταν δὲ ποιήσας ἀλαζόνα πολυτελῆ δεισιδαίμονα δοξοκόπον ἄπληστον χρήματα πολλὰ διδῷς, οὐδὲν περανεῖς." Another Cynic who attacked superstition is, of course, Menippus, whose attitude may be preserved in Varro's remark (Menippearum Reliquiae, ed. Buecheler, fr. 240, on which cf. Krenkel, I, p. 297),

> signa sacra esse desierunt postea quam homines sunt facti,

(which reflects the same attitude as that found in Lucilius' character sketch) and (fr. 558),

> illud vero quodam meae
> ut ego non metuam fulmen, non haruspicem
> tristem, simul ac dici non quaero.[520]

The Stoic attitude toward superstition has been discussed above in section G in relationship to Horace's description of the superstitious man in Sermones, II, 3.281 ff., and should be considered as an additional possible influence on Lucilius' assumed attitude toward superstition. It is interesting to note that the Lucilian fragment now under discussion may have been part of a satire which dealt "...with philosophy, and more particularly with some of the typical vices assailed by Cynics and Stoics...," including avarice and anger as well as superstitition (Fiske, p. 154). The possible connection with avarice is especially interesting, of course, in view of the fragments of Bion and Teles in which superstition and avarice are placed together, and could indicate that the Roman poet used as his source a diatribe in which the two forms of vice were discussed together or in turn. A union of the two themes is suggested by the inclusion of a brief sketch concerning a Syrophoenician usurer (Krenkel, fr. 496 ff.) whose presence in the satire might be hard to explain if one does not assume that the poem dwelt with greed as well as superstition, although not necessarily in the same fashion as the two were discussed by Bion and Teles.[521] Since one cannot be certain of the exact arrangement of the fragments of the satire, however, one cannot be certain how the two themes were connected and must be content with observing only that both themes seem to have been present and that diatribal influence is a strong likelihood.

Other character sketches may be noted here, although they need not be discussed in detail. In book 6, for example, the poet has written the following lines which may describe a poor man (Warmington, III, p. 87) or, as seems more likely, an avaricious man (Krenkel, I, p. 197; cf. Oltramare, p. 95 and diatribal theme 46a, p. 54):

cui neque iumentum est nec servus nec comes ullus:
bulgam, et quidquid habet nummorum, secum habet ipse,
cum bulga cenat, dormit, lavit, omnia in una
sunt homini bulga: bulga haec devincta <la>certo est.

A tone of *spoudaiogeloion* is obvious in these lines and is emphasized by the tricola of the first line, by the asyndeton and homoeoteteuton of the third line, and by the repetition of the word "bulga" in different cases (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xiv. 20 on *traductio* or the repetition of one word). No definite source can be postulated for Lucilius' description, which cannot be traced to Theophrastus' *aischrokerdes* (Diels, xxx), *aneleutheros* (Diels, xxii), or *mikrologos* (Diels, x) and which probably represents the poet's own wit and observation with any outside influence being restricted to that of the epigrammatic style as used by Hellenistic poets.[522] Also noteworthy for its mixture of criticism and humor is the remark (Krenkel, fr. 522-524),

. . . . et
hi quos divitiae producunt et caput ungunt
horridulum...,

which seems to describe the foolish excesses of the newly rich (Krenkel, I, p. 310). One final sketch which deserves mention here differs from the others in that it confines itself to no one specific type, but, as the following lines show, offers a rather bitter description of Romans going about their daily affairs in the forum:

nunc vero a mani ad noctem, festo atque profesto
totus item pariterque die populusque patresque
iactare indu foro se omnes, decedere nusquam,
uni se atque eidem studio omnes dedere et arti,
verba dare ut caute possint, pugnare dolose,
blanditia certare, 'bonum' simulare 'virum' se,
insidias facere, ut si hostes sint omnibus omnes.[523]

Obviously, these lines are not strictly a character sketch, but instead represent the poet's critical observations concerning a flaw in the behavior of his fellow citizens. The development of the theme creates a scene at Rome, but the theme itself has universal application and reminds one of diatribal

XUM

themes warning that the majority of men are mad (Oltramare, theme 76, p. 61, based on Diogenes Laertius, VI, 35), or that men are unhappy because of their own foolishness (Ibid., theme 77; Diogenes Laertius, VI, 71) or stressing that peace of mind brings happiness (Ibid., p. 45, theme 11; Diogenes Laertius VII, 160). Also perhaps involved here is a Cynic theme ridiculing "...the bustling activity, which the Greeks called τὸ πολυπράττειν or πολυπραγμοσύνη, associated with the mad pursuit of riches...," which is exemplified, according to Fiske (p. 221), by the third of the following four lines from an anonymous work on αἰσχροκέρδεια (Heidelberg Papyrus 310, lines 70-73, ed. G. A. Gerhard in Phoenix von Kolophon, Teubner, 1909):

> [ἐγ]ὼ μὲν οὖν, ὦ Πάρνε, βουλοίμην εἶναι
> τἀρκεῦντ' ἐμαυτῶι καὶ νομίζεσθαι χρηστός
> ἢ πολλὰ πρήσσειν καί ποτ' εἰπεῖν τοὺς ἐχθρούς·
> ἁ <•>λῶν δὲ φόρτος ἔνθεν ἦλθεν ἔνθ' ἦ̣λθεν.

Possibly Lucilius had one or more of these themes in mind when he wrote his lines concerning the forum, for the polemical tone of his remarks resembles the frequent attacks directed by the diatribe against vices. Diatribal influence, if present, must be limited to theme and tone, however, for the description itself must be the result of the poet's own experiences.[524]

The character sketches which have been discussed cannot be traced directly to the diatribe, although, as has been shown above, the presence of certain themes increase the likelihood that the poet felt some influence from the Cynic-Stoic genre. Further, the practice of inserting such sketches within the framework of a satire could indicate that Lucilius was familiar with, and influenced by, the diatribal method of using characterizations as one means within a speech to illustrate a point.[525] Another stylistic trait which is

XUM

characteristic of the diatribal style and which also appears in Lucilius is the use of maxims and proverbs to illustrate a point. A rather colorful instance, for example, occurs in fragments 765-766 (Krenkel) where the poet writes,

> ...'hinc ad me, hinc, licet':
> 'anus russum ad armillum',

using a proverb concerning moral "backsliding" (Warmington, III, p. 269) which is in keeping with the style of speech of the slave who seems to be speaking (on the slave, cf. Krenkel, I, p. 90).[526] Fragment 499 (Krenkel; cf. Warmington, III, p. 171) contains another homely proverb which, apparently referring to the shrewd nature of a Syrophoenician usurer, states,

> scit ποιητικὸν esse, videt tunica et toga quid sit.

As a third example of Lucilius' use of proverbs one may cite the verse (Krenkel, fr. 52),

> '...nodum in scirpo, in sano facere ulcus,'

which appears in the satire concerning the council of the gods and which may refer to an especially absurd action or possibly to a tendency to manufacture a problem where none exists (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 125; see above at footnote 474 concerning a similar proverb in Ennius).[527] To these proverbs should be added several concise remarks which have the appearance of maxims. Fragment 224 (Krenkel), for instance, warns,

> maior erat natu: non omnia possumus omnes,

while in fragment 682 (Krenkel) appears the remark,

> porro amici est bene praecipere <et> veri bene praedicere,

which is noteworthy not only for the sentiment which it expresses but also for the wordplay evident in the two infinitives. Additional sayings include fragment 568 (Krenkel),

XUM

denique uti stulto nil sit satis, omnia cum sint,

in which the thought is emphasized by alliteration, and fragments 919-920 (Krenkel),

. . . . . cupiditas
ex homine, <cupido>cupido et stulto numquam tollitur,

made memorable by the obvious paronomasia (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxi. 29 ff.). Concise statements and proverbs such as those which have been mentioned here appeal to a wide audience and are useful for didactic purposes. Their presence in the diatribe and in literature influenced by that genre has been stated repeatedly above (cf. Section D, at footnote 302 and discussion preceding it), and one is tempted to conclude that the diatribe could have been influential on Lucilius' use of the device, although possible influence from other sources, such as epigrams, Greek and Roman Comedy, or Panaetius' theories concerning the conversational style, definitely cannot be ruled out.

Any investigation of the style of Lucilius must include, in addition to the devices which have been mentioned, an examination of the rhetorical elements found within the fragments of the Roman poet. One passage in which the satirist attacks the excessive use of the figure homoeoteleuton already as been quoted and discussed above (see after footnote 482). A second passage which will illustrate Lucilius' proficiency in the handling of rhetorical figures contains a discussion of virtue which, in contrast to many other fragments, seems to be conducted seriously, although the repetition of certain figures might indicate that the poet has constructed a parody of a serious philosophical conversation.[529] The text of this rhetorical section reads as follows (Krenkel, fr. 1342-54):

XUM

virtus, Albine, est, pretium persolvere verum
quis in versamur, quis vivimus rebus, potesse
virtus est homini scire id quod quaeque habeat res,
virtus, scire, homini rectum, utile quid sit, honestum,
quae bona, quae mala item, quid inutile, turpe, inhonestum,
virtus, quaerendae finem re scire modumque,
virtus, divitiis pretium persolvere posse,
virtus, id dare quod re ipsa debetur honori,
hostem esse atque inimicum hominum morumque malorum,
contra defensorem hominum morumque bonorum,
hos magni facere, his bene velle, his vivere amicum,
commoda praeterea patriai prima putare,
deinde parentum, tertia iam postremaque nostra.

In these lines the most conspicuous device is anaphora which is represented not only by the repetition of virtus in successive phrases (cf. Marriotti, p. 9), but also by that of "quis" in 1343, of "quae" in 1346, and of "his" in 1352. Various types of repetition, of course, are prominent in this text and are not limited to the beginnings of phrases or smaller sections. Especially obvious, for example, is the stress on the idea of paying what is due which is expressed through the repeated use of the phrase "pretium persolvere verum" (in 1342 and 1348). The appearance of the words "homini scire" in two successive lines (1344-1345) serves a similar purpose of emphasis, made more obvious by the chiastic arrangement "...homini scire...scire homini...."[530] To these forms of repetition must be added the figures homoeoteleuton, which produces ahe end rhyme of lines 1345-1346 and 1350-1351 (cf. Mariotti, p. 9 and footnote 530), and homoeoptoton, which is found not only in the similar endings of the words preceding the last word in the lines cited as examples of homoeoteleuton, but also in the phrases "quae bona, quae mala item...," and in the repeated accusative endings of lines 1353-1354.[531] Alliteration employing p's (in lines 1342, 1348, and 1353-1354, on which cf. Mariotti, p. 9 text and note 3), v's (in lines 1342-1343, and 1352), and s's (in lines 1342-1345 and 1348) complete the list of repetitive figures used by Lucilius in these lines.

XUM

In addition to the devices which already have been mentioned, several other rhetorical figures can be observed in the text under investigation. For example, the poet expresses his views through antithesis in lines 1345-1346, where the words "rectum," "utile," and "honestum," are contrasted with their opposites, and where the equally obvious antithesis of "bona" and "mala" appears.[532] A third antithesis, brought strongly to the reader's attention through the devices homoeoteleuton and homoeoptoton, is found in the opposition of "malorum" and "bonorum" in lines 1350-1351. One should note how carefully arranged each of these antitheses is and how each is emphasized through its position or through the use of one of the repetitive figures. Also obviously contrived are two conspicuous instances of the figure isocolon, the first of which appears in line 1343 in the phrases, "...quis in versamur..." and "...quis vivimus rebus,..," where anaphora and alliteration further stress the symmetry, while the second example comprises line 1352 and forms a tricolon (cf. Mariotti, p. 9, who mentions this line only as a tricolon) which is emphasized by anaphora and alliteration. Another effective use of a tricolon takes the form of a crescendo in line 1346, since each colon is longer than the one preceding it, and the combination of tricolon, anaphora, homoeoptoton, and asyndeton (in the last three words of the line) must leave no doubt in the reader's mind concerning the things which a man who wishes to possess _virtutem_ must know.[532] To the figures mentioned thus far should be added the frequent asyndeton which appears in lines 1343, 1345, 1346 (cf. Mariotti, p. 9), 1352, and 1353-1354, and which sets off the point made in each of these sections since, as the _Rhetorica ad Herennium_ has observed (IV, xxx. 41), it is a figure which

"...et acrimoniam habet in se et vehementissimum est et ad brevitatem adcommodatum." Because of the accumulation of the figures which have been discussed and especially because of the use of the repetitive figures, of isocolon, and of antithesis, one must question the common assumption (cf. Mariotti, pp. 8-10; Krenkel, II, p. 711) that this fragment represents an apparently serious exposition of the teachings of the Stoic Panaetius and must not eliminate totally the possibility that Lucilius has created a parody by setting the doctrines of the Stoic within the framework of a style at variance with Panaetius' doctrines concerning the conversational style. Perhaps the simplicity of the diction of the passage, however, should be considered as a check on the elaborate ornamentation ordinarily produced by the figures involved here. The lack of a context for the lecture on virtue, of course, hampers any attempt to determine its actual tone.

The lengthy text which just has been discussed reveals Lucilius' familiarity with various rhetorical devices and his ability to employ them with ease and skill. A few other fragments deserve quotation here to indicate further the rhetorical elements commonly found in the poetry of Lucilius. Of special interest are two passages which reveal the poet's use of rhetorical methods of reasoning. The first of these (Krenkel, fr. 48-50), which states

> 'si me nescire hoc nescis quod quaerere dico,
> quare divinas quicquam? an tu qua<ere>re debes
> ipse? et si scis q<uod>b<ellum>e<st>scire, hoc d<are>t<empta>,'

is preserved by the rhetorician Julius Rufinianus, who uses these lines (cf. Krenkel, fr. 48-50 and C. Halm, ed. Rhetores Latini Minores, p. 45. 29) as an example of an enthymeme which, according to his definition, "...fit cum periodos orationis ex contrariis sententiis astringitur....".[534] The confusing manner in which the speaker asks the rhetorical question which composes his enthymeme is intended to confound his opponent and perhaps also represents the poet's attempt to satirize this type of argument through a "reductio ad absurdum." Perhaps underlying these lines is a Cynic topic concerning the foolishness of belief in oracles or divination (Oltramare, p. 96 and theme 94, p. 65, "toute croyance aux oracles et aux devins est ridicule") which is made especially ironic and humorous if, as Krenkel things (I, p. 64), it is a remark directed by one god, probably Romulus, against Apollo. A second example of a rhetorical argument, which, however, is not an enthymeme of the type described by Rufinianus, appears in the following lines (Krenkel, fr. 205-207):

> nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset,
> hoc sat erat; nunc cum hoc non est, qui credimus porro
> divitias ullas animum mi explere potisse?

The argument here at first seems to take the form of a conditional syllogism of the form "if p, then q; not q; therefore not p," which is one of the modes of Stoic logic (cf. Bocheński, op. cit., p. 98). If it followed that mode completely, the argument could be paraphrased as follows:

> If what is sufficient for a man were able to be sufficient
> for me, then this was sufficient.
> This was not sufficient.
> Therefore, what is sufficient for a man was not
> able to be sufficient for me.

Instead of the expected conclusion, however, appears the apparent beginning of another argument, relying on the first, which also is not completed but rather is interrupted by a rhetorical question which exposes the speaker's intention to show that his desire for wealth seems unlikely ever to be sated. The average listener, carried along by the flow of words and by the sudden impact of the rhetorical question, will think that he has heard a complete argument and that he has been convinced. It is this tendency to persuade without thorough proof and to argue from what can only be classed as probabilities, which seem to appeal to the listener's common sense, which makes an argument such as this one rhetorical.[535]

Other passages, which are longer than the average Lucilian fragment, also must be mentioned here as good illustrations of the poet's use of rhetoric. For example, fragments 108-111 (Krenkel), which observe,

> verum haec ludus ibi, susque omnia deque fuerunt,
> susque et deque fuere, inquam, omnia ludus iocusque:
> illud opus durum, ut Setinum accessimus finem,
> αἰγίλιποι montes, Aetnae omnes, asperi Athones,

are noteworthy for the figures epanalepsis (lines 108-109; cf. Mariotti, p. 87; cf. Quintilian, VIII, iii. 51; Arbusow, op. cit., p. 39),[536] chiasmus (lines 108-111: *ludus*...*ludus*), *homoeoteleuton* (lines 108-109 and 111), alliteration (line 111), and *isocolon* (line 111 - a tricolon) which ornament them. The following lines (Krenkel, fr. 789-95), which not only ridicule the same Lupus whom Lucilius attacked in his parody of the council of the gods in book I of his satires (cf. Krenkel, II, p. 443) but also play upon the theories of elements[537] held by various philosophers, also deserve a brief stylistic analysis:

> . . . hoc cum feceris,
> cum ceteris reus una tradetur Lupo.
> non aderit: ἀρχαῖς hominem et stoechiis simul
> privabit, igni cum |et aqua interdixerit.
> duo habet stoechia, adfuerit: anima et corpore
> (γῆ corpus, anima est πνεῦμα), posterioribus
> stoechiis, si id maluerit, privabit tamen.

The most conspicuous figure appearing in this text is the *homoeoteleuton* found in the verbs "aderit," "privabit," and "interdixerit" in lines 791-792, where asyndeton also is evident (as it is in lines 793 and 794-795). To these figures should be added the basically parallel structure found in the phrases "...ἀρχαῖς...privabit," and "...igni...interdixerit," and the alliteration of s's in line 791. Further, the use of "feceris" and "ceteris" (lines 789-790)

XUM

must be considered a form of *paronomasia*, in spite of the obvious grammatical differences in the words, while the arrangement of the phrases "...γῆ corpus..." and "...anima...πνεῦμα" is an obvious use of chiasmus, which would be a perfect example if the "est" and the "anima" could be transposed. The presence of all of these figures does not prevent the style of the passage from being rather simple and straightforward, employing no really complex sentences and made complex only by the use of technical philosophical terms in a humorous manner.

To the passages which have been analyzed may be added a third which takes the form of an anecdote relating the humiliation of one Titus Albucius, an overly-enthusiastic philhellene (cf. Warmington, III, p. 31), and addressed to the victim himself (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 65 on circumstances). Lucilius writes (Krenkel, fr. 89-95),

> "Graecum te, Albuci, quam Romanum atque Sabinum,
> municipem Porti, Tritani, centurionum,
> praeclarorum hominum ac primorum signiferumque,
> maluisti dici. Graece ergo praetor Athenis,
> id quod maluisti, te, cum ad me accedis, saluto:
> 'chaere,' inquam, 'Tite.' lictores, turma omnis chorusque:
> 'chaere, Tite.' hinc hostis mi Albucius, hinc inimicus."[538]

In these lines a facetious humor is built up by the antithesis of the single term "Graecum," by which Albucius prefers to be addressed, to the series of proper terms which could be applied to him and which, through the use of assonance, asyndeton, homeoptoton, and finally isocolon (in 19ne 91) seem to take on the character of heroic epithets when compared with the simple "Graecum," and with the simple diction of the remaining lines. This comic exaggeration is continued in line 94, when the speaker refers to his *lictores* as "...turma omnis chorusque...," and has them echo his greeting. Finally, line 95 draws the anecdote to an emphatic conclusion through the use of

XUM

anaphora ("hinc...hinc), asyndeton, and homoeoteleuton connecting "albucius" and "inimicus."

The long fragments of Lucilius which have been discussed provide the best examples of the poet's use of rhetoric, since they allow one to study the effects produced by the use of several figures in conjunction. Several brief fragments, however, also are worthy of mention since they illustrate the poet's frequent use of certain rhetorical elements. Apparently a favorite defice of the poet is the rhetorical question and to the examples already given (cf. Krenkel, fr. 48-50 and above at footnote 354; fr. 205-207 after footnote 354) should be added fragments 444-445 (Krenkel),

> aut forte omnino ac fortuna vincere bello.
> si forte ac temere omnino, quid rursum ad honorem?,

and fragments 335-336 (Krenkel), which display a tone of spoudaiogeloion,

> ...quid ergo, si ostrea Cerco
> cognorit fluvium limum ac caenum sapere ipsum?[539]

Anaphora is a second device frequently employed by Lucilius and adds emphasis to lines such as (Krenkel, fr. 98-99),

> tu partem laudis caperes, tu gaudia mecum
> partisses. . . .

where the poet's enthusiasm is expressed also with the aid of the figures isocolon and homoeoteleuton. As additional examples of anaphora one may cite fragments 298-299 (Krenkel),

> . . .quod gracila est, pernix, quod pectore puro,
> quod puero similis...,

fragment 309 (Krenkel),

> quarum et abundemus serum et quarum indigeamus,

and fragment 646 (Krenkel),

> pars difflatur vento, pars autem obrigescit frigore.

Instances of the figure asyndeton which also should be mentioned here include the remark (Krenkel, fr. 38),

> 'vultus item ut facies: mors, icterus morbus, venenum,

as well as fragment 61 (Krenkel),

> 'chirodyti aurati, ricae, thoracia, mitrae,

and the statement (Krenkel, fr. 132),

> ostrea nulla fuit, non purpura, nulla peloris.[540]

Polysyndeton occurs less frequently than does asyndeton, and the following line will be sufficient as an example (Krenkel, fr. 257):

> pluma atque amphitapoe et si aliud quid deliciarum.

Two other important figures which already have been illustrated by various fragments of Lucilius are homoeoptoton and homoeoteleuton. As additional examples of the former may be cited the lines (Krenkel, fr. 306-306a)

> . . . <fusus>
> intus modo stet rectus, foris subtemnis panus,

and the verse (Krenkel, fr. 1312),

> si facie facies praestat, si corpore corpus.

Homoeoteleuton, which occurs more frequently than does homoeoptoton, is evident in lines such as fragment 177 (Krenkel),

> . . .qui edit se, hic comedit me,

which also serves as an example of paronomasia, fragments 266-267 (Krenkel),

> rador, subvellor, desquamor, pumicor, ornor,
> expolior, pingor...,

a rather extreme and humorous example, and fragment 397 (Krenkel),

> non laudare hominem quemquam neque mu facere umquam.[541]

Along with the homoeoteleuton in these three examples appears the figure isocolon, which often is used in connection with homoeoptoton or homoeoteleuton

XUM

in the fragments of Lucilius as well as in the works of other authors. Isocolon also occurs without these figures, as, for instance, in the command (Krenkel, fr. 787)

> coice te intro ac bono animo es,

or in the criticism (Krenkel, fr. 727),

> paulo hoc melius quam mediocre, hoc minus malum
> quam ut pessumum,

where the alliteration is softer than the sentiment expressed, or, finally, in fragment 270 (Krenkel),

> tristes, difficiles sumus, fastidimus bonorum.[542]

To isocolon, homoeoptoton, and homoeoteleuton must be added the figures paronomasia and antithesis, which complete the list of the five "so-called Gorgianic figures" (Rhetorica ad Herennium, p. 298, note a). Several instances of antithesis already have been noted in the discussion of other fragments, but the following fragments also deserve quotation (Krenkel, fr. 609-617):

> summis nitere opibus, at ego contra ut dissimilis siem
> . . . .
> ut ego effugiam, quod te in primis cupere apisci intellego.

As examples of paronomasia one may cite fragment 56 (Krenkel),

> ...fandam atque auditam interabimus <famam>

for the play on "fandam" and "famam," as well as the remark (Krenkel, fr. 78-79),

> '. . .quae ego nunc <huic> Aemilio prae-
> canto atque exigo et excanto. . .,'

with the etymological play involved in the verbs "praecanto" and "excanto," a type of wordplay similar to that in the descriptive statement (Krenkel, fr. 1150-1151),

XUM

> Coelius conlusor Galloni scurra, trigonum
> cum ludet, scius ludet et eludet....[543]

Additional good examples of this figure, which are numerous, include the humorous characterization (Krenkel, fr. 422-424),

> Quintus Opimius ille, Iugurtini pater huius,
> et formosus homo fuit et famosus, utrumque
> primo adulescens; posterius dare rectius sese,

with its obvious play on "formosus" and "famosus," and the wish (Krenkel, fr. 702),

> quam non solum devorare se omnia ac devorrere.[544]

In addition to the Gorgianic figures and the other devices which have been discussed, several other rhetorical figures deserve mention here. Chief among these is alliteration, a favorite device of Lucilius, which often has been noted in the analyses of his fragments undertaken in this study. To the other examples should be added fragment 161 (Krenkel),

> succussatoris, taetri tardique caballi,

when the sound seems to reflect the jerky movement of the horse (cf. Warmington's translation, III, p. 51), fragment 194 (Krenkel),

> deficit alma Ceres, nec plebes pane potitur,

which features the alliteration of p's which Lucilius frequently employs (cf. Mariotti, p. 9, note 3, and Krenkel, fr. 195-197), and fragment 217 (Krenkel),

> custodem classis catapultas, pila, sarisas,

in which the asyndeton is obvious.[545] Another figure used effectively by Lucilius is conduplicatio which the Rhetorica ad Herennium (IV, xxviii. 38) defines as "...cum ratione amplificationis aut commiserationis eiusdem unius aut plurium verborum iteratio...."[546] The following lines will serve as an example of the Lucilian usage (Krenkel, fr. 750-751):

XUM

omnia viscatis manibus leget, <omnia sumet,>
omnia, crede mihi: p<ol>res se<cum>auferet omnis.

Similar to conduplicatio is epanalepsis which occurs in the following wish (Krenkel, fr. 10-12):

'vel<lem>concilio vestrum, quod dicitis olim,
caelicolae, <hic habitum, vellem>adfuissemus priore
concilio.' ....[546]

One final device which must be added here is chiasmus, a careful arrangement of words which must reveal planning on the part of the author. As examples one may cite fragment 164 (Krenkel),

su<bi>cit huic fulcrum, fulmentas quattuor addit,

where the word order seems to reflect the action involved, fragment 579 (Krenkel)

proras despoliate et detundete guberna

made emphatic by its alliteration, and fragment 1088,

producunt me ad te, tibi me haec ostendere cogunt.

All of the rhetorical elements which have been discussed indicate Lucilius' debt to the training which must have familiarized him with the rhetorical figure, devices, and arguments which he employs in his poetry. The presence of the more obvious figures, such as alliteration, homoeoptoton, homoeoteleuton, and anaphora, must be seen as evidence that the poet did not adhere totally to the plain conversational style advocated by Panaetius, in which such ornaments would have seemed discordant and artificial unless specifically used briefly to create a humorous effect or emphasize a point.[547] Despite the use of these and other figures, however, Lucilius' poetry retains a simplicity of style and theme which removes it from the realm of that type of oratory known as the Asiatic style and characterized by "...amplification and pomposity...,"[548] and also from the bombastic style of the tragedians whom the poet often criticises (see above at footnote 489 ff.). One is tempted to assume that the combination of a simple style with numerous rhetorical devices represents the influence of the diatribe on Lucilius, with Lucilius' satires then being the result of an amalgamation of the theories of Panaetius and the entertaining practices of the diatribe, with additional influence stemming, of course, from Ennius, Lucilius' predecessor in the genre of the "satura."[549] Such an assumption is strengthened by the poet's use of so many of the figures commonly found in the diatribe, but, again, one cannot discount the importance of Lucilius' own education. Further, one must consider the warning of M. L. Clarke, who observes concerning the rhetorical figures used by the poet Vergil ("Rhetorical Influences in the Aeneid," Greece and Rome, 18, 1949, p. 23) that "some of the figures are as much poetical as oratorical. They belong to poetry in its own right and are not borrowed from the orator. Quintilian indeed reminds his readers that poets are not altogether good models for orators because of the freedom with which they use figures. "If, however, sufficient diatribal themes were present in Lucilius' fragments to warrant the conclusion that the poet was familiar with the Cynic-Stoic genre, then one might, with some justification, assume that some of the rhetorical figures found their way into the satirist's work not simply because of his own training or even because of his knowledge of poetry, but rather because of their effective use by Bion, Teles, or others who composed diatribes. One must continue this survey of the possible connection between Lucilius and the diatribe, then, with an investigation of topics within the Roman poet's satires which resemble common themes of diatribal literature.

A few possible diatribal themes already have been mentioned in various sections of this discussion of Lucilius, but others, must be grouped together now to indicate the extent of possible influence from the diatribe. Themes criticizing wealth and luxury, first of all, frequently make their appearance in various satires. The poet attacks the luxurious habits of the rich, for example, in fragments 522-524 (Krenkel),

> . . . et
> hi quos divitiae producunt et caput ungunt
> horridulum. . .,

and in fragments 14 and 15 (Krenkel) ridicules, through the mouth of Romulus, luxuries of dress, and of bedding, such as (cf. Oltramare, p. 94),

> praetextae ac tunicae: Lydorum opus sordidu<lu>m omne,

and,

> psilae atque amphitapi villis ingentibus molles.

Although these remarks are directed at a Roman audience and seem to urge Romans to, as Oltramare has observed (p. 94), "...renoncer à toutes les habitudes de luxe qu'ils ont empruntées aux étrangers...," they may have been inspired by a combination of the poet's own views with his knowledge of certain diatribal themes concerning luxury which he adapted to suit his own needs. For example, the diatribe commonly urged its listeners to adopt a simple form of life (theme 29, Oltramare, p. 49), to abandon the luxuries of weakening baths and of fine clothes (themes 36 and 39 and quotation connected with 31, Oltramare, pp. 50-52),[550] and even to do without a bed (theme 37a, Oltramare, p. 52, based on Teles, 53.3) by using the ground instead (cf. Teles, p. 7.5, Bion's prosopopoiia of Penia). Closely connected with these attacks on luxury are criticisms of avarice and of gluttony which appear in Lucilius as well as in the diatribe. Fragments concerned with avarice or with greed for money already have been discussed above (see above at footnote 507 and after footnote 534), and to these should be added the observation (Krenkel, fr. 622; cf.

Oltramare, p. 95, footnote 4),

> mordicus petere aurum e flamma expediat, e caeno cibum,

which seems to refer to miserliness (Warmington, III, fr. 662, p. 213). The corrupting effects of greed also are not neglected by the poet, who willingly observes (Krenkel, fr. 1244; cf. Oltramare, p. 95) that

> nequam aurum est, auris quovis vehementius ambit,

and notes with a sarcastic tone (Krenkel, fr. 1127-28) that,

> aurum atque ambitio specimen virtutis utrique est:
> tantum habeas, tantum ipse sies tantique habearis.

These two remarks are illustrations of the ease with which a general theme can be given a specific application and used to criticise a rampant vice contemporary with the poet.

Gluttony and gourmandism provide additional examples of general themes applied by the poet to his own milieu. For example, Cicero (de finibus II, 8.24-25; Krenkel, introduction to fr. 1130-1137) preserves the following fragments (Krenkel, fr. 1130-1137) by Lucilius, which deal first with Laelius himself, who according to Cicero's introduction to these lines, was called "...'sapiens,' quod non intellegeret quid suavissimum esset - nec enim sequitur, ut, cui cor sapiat, ei non sapiat palatum - sed quid parvi id duceret...," and then with a remark made by him (cf. Oltramare, p. 94, footnote 9):

> o lapathe, ut iactare, nec es satis cognitus qui sis.
> in quo Laelius clamores sophos ille solebat
> edere, compellans gumias ex ordine nostros.
> . . . .
> 'o Publi, o gurges Galloni, es homo miser, inquit
> 'cenasti in vita numquam bene, cum omnia in ista
> consumis squilla atque acupensere cum decimano.'

Another attack directed by Lucilius against gluttony, and possibly also against the extravagances of the wealthy (cf. Warmington, III, pp. 181-183) complains (Krenkel, fr. 555-556), complains (Krenkel, fr. 555-556),

> milia tu centum frumenti tollis medimnum,
> vini mille cadum...,

and adds in apparent contrast (Krenkel, fr. 557),

> ...aeque fruniscor ego ac tu.

Further, in a satire apparently concerned with moderation (Krenkel, I, p. 75) the poet, speaking of an elaborate dinner observes (Krenkel, fr. 448-451; cf. Oltramare, p. 94, footnote 9),

> hoc fit idem in cena: dabis ostrea milibus nummum
> empta...
> . . . .
> et non, pauper uti, Samio curtoque catino,

and, referring to (Krenkel, fr. 453; cf. Oltramare, p. 94, footnote 9)

> idem epulo cibus atque epulae Iovis omnipotens,

urges (Krenkel, fr. 455; cf. Oltramare, p. 94, footnote 9):

> tollantur primum dominia atque sodalicia omnia.

Contrasting with this scene of luxury is the description of a simple meal, found in the famous satire dealing with Lucilius' journey to Sicily, for the poet writes that (Krenkel, fr. 132 and 134-135)

> ostrea nulla fuit, non purpurea, nulla peloris
> . . . .
> . . . nam mel regionibus illis
> incrustatus calix, rutai caulis habetur.

Parallels for these themes concerning avarice, gluttony, and gourmandism can be found in diatribal literature. Concerning avarice, for example, Bion offers a warning when he observes (Diogenes Laertius, IV, 50; theme 20c, Oltramare, p. 47) concerning a miser, "οὐχ οὗτος...τὴν οὐσίαν κέκτηται, ἀλλ' ἡ οὐσία τοῦτον." Bion also warns that wealth is only a loan given by Fortune (theme 20a, Oltramare, p. 47; Stobaeus V, 943.20), to which one should add the observation, attributed to Antisthenes by Epictetus, that the gifts of

XUM

Fortune are worthless loans (theme 12a, Oltramare, p. 46, from Epictetus, III, 24. 68). Further, one finds in Teles the view that wealth is not a good (theme 20, Oltramare, p. 47), to which should be added the opinion of Bion as rendered by Oltramare (p. 47, theme 20d), that "*la valeur d'un riche* sans vertu n'est que celle de sa bourse...,"[551] which Fiske (p. 237) connects with fragments 1127-28 of Lucilius, which are quoted above. Possibly themes such as these inspired the Roman poet in his attacks on greed which he then developed along lines suited to his own observations.

Gluttony and gourmandism and the simple life which is at variance with them also are topics which were not overlooked by the diatribe writers. The lesson learned by Diogenes of Sinope, for example, when he threw away his drinking cup after he saw a child using only his hands to drink illustrates, according to Oltramare (p. 49, theme 30), the theme "nous devons *satisfaire nos besoins aussi simplement que possible*...." In the famous prosopopoiia of Poverty (Penia), created by Bion (Teles, pp. 6-8) one finds examples of other Cynic themes concerned with food and drink, for *Penia*, in connection with her castigation of the dissatisfied man, points out the availability of simple food and pure water (p. 7. 4-5 and 7.7) and ridicules the expensive tastes of the gourmand (cf. themes 31, 31c and 31f, Oltramare, p. 50). As another example of the Cynic views on gluttony and debauchery and the simple life which contrasts with them, the following lines by Crates deserve quotation in full (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 85; cited by Oltramares as theme 90, p. 64, "*la débauche* est un vice..."; cf. D. R. Dudley, p. 44):

Πήρη τις πόλις ἐστὶ μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι τύφω,
καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυπος, οὐδὲν ἔχουσα ,
εἰς ἣν οὔτε τις εἰσπλεῖ ἀνὴρ μωρὸς παράσιτος,

XUM

οὔτε λίχνος πόρνης ἐπαγαλλόμενος πυγῇσιν·
ἀλλὰ θύμον καὶ σκόρδα φέρει καὶ σῦκα καὶ ἄρτους,
ἐξ ὧν οὐ πολεμοῦσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ τούτων,
οὐχ ὅπλα κέκτηνται περὶ κέρματος ,οὐ περὶ δόξης.

Themes such as those illustrated by these comments of Diogenes, Bion, and Crates, possibly underlie Lucilius' scornful reference to the excessive amounts of wine and grain being taken away by someone (Krenkel, fr. 555-556 quoted above),[552] as well as the poet's description of banqueting (Krenkel, fr. 448-455) and his contrasting favorable picture of a simple meal (Krenkel, fragments 132-135).

In addition to the topics which have been mentioned Lucilius' poetry features other themes which may have originated in popular philosophical works. Fragment 270 (Krenkel), for example, observes,

> tristes, difficiles sumus, fastidimus bonorum,

apparently commenting on discontent with one's lot (cf. Warmington, III, p. 97) and thus dealing with a common diatribal theme which finds expression in Bion's prosopopoiia of *Penia* and in an effective section of Teles' *Peri penias kai ploutou* (Teles, pp. 42-43).[553] Discontent also is described in the verse (Krenkel, fr. 568),

> denique uti stulto nil sit satis, omnia cum sint,

which could refer only to greed, but which additionally seems to reflect the sentiments expressed by Teles in the passage just mentioned above. Closely related to the concept of dissatisfaction with one's lot is one's envy of others, a fault which is rejected by Lucilius in the remark (Krenkel, fr. 723-724; cf. Warmington, III, p. 247),

XUM

> nulli me invidere, non strabonem fieri saepius
> deliciis me istorum. . .,

and which is a major topic of Teles' diatribe Peri apatheias.[554] A better attitude from the Cynic-Stoic point of view could be that expressed by the statement (Krenkel, fr. 734),

> ceterum quidquid sit, quid non sit, ferre aequo animo ac fortiter,

which seems to reflect the concepts of autarcheia[555] or "l'independence morale..." (theme 26, Oltramare, p. 49) and of adiaphora or "la tranquillité de l'âme..." (theme 11, Oltramare, p. 45) which, of course, cannot exist together with dissatisfaction and which imply a realization of the power of Fortune (cf. Teles, pp. 5-6; cf. p. 62 and Oltramare, theme 57a, p. 57 "le sage défie la fortune....") over one's life. Remarks concerning Fortune do occur in Lucilius in addition to these themes dealing with discontent and its opposite. For example, fragment 742 contains the partial remark (cf. Oltramare, p. 95, footnote 2),

> cum sciam nihil esse in vita proprium mortali datum,

which possibly reflects the various themes, prominent in diatribal literature (cf. Bion in Teles, pp. 5-6), concerning the impermanence of the gifts of Fortune (cf. Oltramare, p. 46, themes 12, 12a, 12b; p. 47, theme 20a). A similar view of Fortune is expressed in the lines (Krenkel, fr. 551-552),

> cetera contemnit et in usura omnia ponit
> non magna: proprium vero nil neminem habere,

and in the remark (Krenkel, fr. 1219)

> intereunt, labuntur, eunt rursum omnia vorsum,

whose actual context, however, is uncertain.

XUM

To these topics dealing with Fortune and one's correct attitude toward life should be added Lucilius' comments on the proper way of life. The following series of related fragments (Krenkel, 459-465), for example, seem to stress the virtues of a quiet and honorable existence as opposed to an active, presumably political, way of life (cf. Warmington, III, p. 157):

> dilectum video studiose vulgus habere.
> . . . .
> naumachiam licet haec, inquam, alveolumque putare, et
> calces. delectes te, hilo non rectius vivas.
> . . . .
> 'quin potius vitam degat sedatus quietam'-
> 'quanto antiquius, quam facere hoc, fecisse videri.
> non paucis malle ac'sapientibus' esse probatum
> ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.[556]

Possibly influential on these lines were diatribal themes stressing the idea that fame is not a good (theme 15, Oltramare, p. 46), or that the power of a ruler is not a good (theme 17, Oltramare, p. 47),[557] both of which could be adapted to suit a Roman audience. The concept that peace of mind brings happiness (theme 11, Oltramare, p. 45; cf. Teles, *Peri apatheias*) and the view that virtue is the only good (theme 48, Oltramare, p. 54) also seem to have found expression in these Lucilian fragments. Finally, the Cynic withdrawal from participation in public affairs and the view that the true Cynic sage has no country (themes 71 and 72, Oltramare, p. 60) also must be seen as concepts underlying the opinions expressed in fragments 459-465.

The fragments of Lucilius also include comments which can be considered reflections of the theme expressed by Oltramare (theme 66, p. 59; cited by him on p. 94 in reference to Lucilius) as, "*le sage 'mord' ses amis* par sa franchise, pour leur être utile...," and represented by a remark of Diogenes of Sinope who (Oltramare, p. 59, quoted by him from Stobaeus, ed. Hense, III, 13, 44) "...ἔλεγεν ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι κύνες τοὺς ἐχθροὺς

XUM

δάκνουσιν, ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς φίλους, ἵνα σώσω...."[557] Sentiments concerning a friend's right to frankness appear in such Lucilian statements as (Krenkel, fr. 682),

> porro amici est bene praecipere <e>t veri bene praedicere,

and (Krenkel, fr. 958; cf. Oltramare, p. 94, footnote 1),

> homini amico et familiari non est mentiri meum.

To these remarks may be added fragments 964-965 (Krenkel),

> . . . mihi necesse est eloqui,
> nam scio| Amyclas tacendo periisse. . .,

as well as the verses (Krenkel, fr. 1102-1103 and 1105-1106) cf. Oltramare, p. 94 on 1103),

> nolito tibi me male dicere posse putare
> . . . .
> quem scis scire tuas omnes maculasque notasque.
> . . . .
> hoc etiam accipe quod dico: nam pertinet ad rem.
> . . . .
> siscuti te, qui ea, quae speciem vitae esse putemus.

Other important topics found in Lucilius as well as in the Cynic-Stoic diatribal tradition include the proper attitude toward old age and standards of behavior in sexual matters. Concerning age, first of all, Lucilius warns the young (Krenkel, fr. 806) that,

> prospiciendum ergo in senectam nunc <ab>adulescentia est,

possibly reflecting the view that old age is not an evil to be feared (theme 24, Oltramare, p. 48; cf. Bion in Diogenes Laertius IV, 51). Another satire includes the observation (Krenkel, fr. 560),

> rugosi passique senes eadem omnia quaerunt,

which probably refers to the avaricious man who even in old age does not change his ways (cf. Warmington, III, p. 184, footnote a, and Fiske, p. 231) but which also can be interpreted as a reference to the diatribal topic which urges old men to live as befits their age and not to try to conduct themselves as young men (theme 24b, Oltramare, p. 48). Perhaps this same theme is reflected in the verses,

> ante foras autem et triclini limina quidam
> perditus Tiresias tussi grandaevus gemebat,

which Warmington (III, p. 71) groups with fragments concerning a banquet scene. Examples of themes dealing with sexual matters are more numerous than those of themes concerned with age and can be divided into fragments dealing with pederasty, with prostitution, and with adultery. Lucilius' remarks on pederasty vary from attacks to praise, presumably depending upon the poet's source for each.[559] For instance, in the same satire (book 30) in which occur the fragments (Krenkel, fr. 991-992),

> sublatus pudor omnis, licentia fenus refertur
> . . . .
> . . . quandoque pudor ex pectore cessit,

appears the rather scornful line (Krenkel, fr. 994)

> imberbi androgyni, barbati moechocinaedi ,

which seems to be directed against pederasty (cf. Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1). Another fragment, included in a satire which is a parody of the trial of Q. Mucius Scaevola for extortion (cf. Warmington, III, p. 18), states (Krenkel, fr. 73),

> '. . . paedicum iam excoquit omnes,'

an obvious example of invective which cannot be taken seriously, but which still must be assumed to represent a commonly-held opinion that pederasty was a vice, since otherwise the insult would be ineffective. In these fragments which seem to attack pederasty, Lucilius is true to the diatribal tradition which argued that the practice was a vice (theme 88, Oltramare, p. 63, based on Diogenes Laertius, VI, 62). Other fragments, however, seem to take an opposing view, for one finds the remarks (Krenkel, fr. 292-295),

> nunc praetor, tuus est: meus, si discesseris horno,
> Gentius. . . .
> . . . .
> <ecce>hic est Macedo, si Gentius longius flaccet,

as well as the question (Krenkel, fr. 296-297),

> huncin ego umquam Hyacintho hominem, cortinipotentis
> deliciis, contendi?. . .,

and the fragment (Krenkel, fr. 178),

> cumque hic tam formonsus homo ac te dignus puellus,

all of which seem to imply an attitude favorable to the practice (cf. Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1, on these fragments). Despite Apuleius remark that he finds fault with Lucilius "...quod Gentium et Macedonem pueros directis nominibus carmine suo prostituerit. . ." (Apol. 10, quoted from Warmington, III, fr. 308-9, p. 94),[560] one cannot assume that Lucilius intended these lines as an autobiographical statement and must assume instead that here the poet has employed a common topic of Greek lyric poetry, modernizing it (cf. Fiske, p. 50 ff., for the term) to suit his own circle who would recognize Lucilius' method and thus see no contradiction in the fact that the poet could attack and praise the same practice (cf. footnote 559).

In addition to the satires dealing with pederisty Lucilius' fragments include poems dealing with liasons, prostitution, and adultery which seem to reflect the treatment of these topics in the diatribe. For example, fragments 879-880 (Krenkel),

> . . .<tibi>erat, scabiosum
> eicere istum abs te quam primum et perdere amorem,

as well as the remark (Krenkel, fr. 1004), sic laqueis, manicis, pedicis mens inretita est,

which seems to refer to a man entrapped by the wiles of his wife (cf. Krenkel, I, pp. 99-100; cf. Warmington, III, p. 359), are given by Oltramare (p. 93, footnote 1) as examples of the theme (87, p. 63), "l'amour passionné est un mal. . .," although the second passage here (fr. 1004) seems more likely to be a development of the theme "les passions asservissent. . ." (84, Oltramare, p. 63; not mentioned by him in connection with Lucilius). The diatribe not only gave warnings concerning passions, but also urged that one should satisfy one's sexual needs in a simple manner (theme 32, Oltramare, p. 50), that one should avoid adultery (theme 32a, Oltramare, p. 50; cf. Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1), and that one should prefer humble prostitutes (theme 32c, Oltramare, p. 51) to expensive courtesans (theme 32b, Oltramare, p. 50). Each of these themes seems to make an appearance within the satires of Lucilius. The poet addresses himself to the dangers involved in adultery in the fourth satire of book 28 (Krenkel, fr. 778-798, cf. Krenkel, I, p. 91) which seems to depict the attack by an enraged husband against the house in which his wife is hiding, presumably with her lover and possibly in imitation of a scene from New Comedy (cf. Warmington, III, pp. 256-257). The attack itself, combined with fragment (Krenkel, fr. 788)

minitari aperte capitis dicturum diem,

and the comic description of an action brought before the magistrate Lupus (Krenkel, fr. 789-95; see above after footnote 537), serve to indicate, although in a humorous fashion, some of the dangers to which an adulterer exposes himself.[561] Additional warning against adultery is provided by the poet in the verses (Krenkel, fr. 882-884; cf. Warmington, III, p. 295; cf. Fiske, p. 272 for a different interpretation),

> . . . nunc tu
> contra venis, vel qui in nuptis voluisse neges te
> nec sine permitie. . .,

which also refers to the penalties risked by both parties caught in adultery (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 479).

The way to avoid danger, of course, is to follow the advice given in themes 32, 32b, and 32c mentioned above, a fact which does not escape Lucilius. In a satire which deals with an affair with a Courtesan (Krenkel, I, p. 87) and which seems to be a parody of a scene from Terence's Eunuchus (see above at footnote 424), for example, the young man in love asks (Krenkel, fr. 700),

> ego enim an perficiam ut me amare expediat. . . ?

concerning a "meretrix" who is mentioned as (Krenkel, fr. 702; cf. Warmington, III, p. 239),

> quam non solum devorare se omnia ac devorrere.

The plight of the "adulescens" seems to illustrate the dangers of engaging in a *liaison* with an expensive courtesan (theme 32b, Oltramare, p. 50) whose whims can ruin a man.[562] The only safe course, then, is that advocated by theme 32c, and apparently also by Lucilius (cf. Fiske, p. 272), although fragments 209-210 (Krenkel),

> absterge lacrimas et divos ture precemur
> consilium fassi, placeatne impune luperis,

which are rather obscure (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 181 and Warmington, III, p. 79), seem to hint, probably facietiously, that even an affair with a "lupa" contains danger.[563] The poet does refer, however, to prostitutes (Krenkel, fr. 885-886; cf. Warmington, III, p. 299) as,

> quae et poscent minus et praeb<eb>unt rectius multo
> et sine flagitio. . . ,

XUM

and advises his reader that (Krenkel, fr. 887-888),

> hic corpus solidum invenies, hic stare papillas
> pectore marmoreo. . . .504

If one prefers, of course, (Krenkel, fr. 338-340)

> si nihil ad faciem et si olim lupa prostibulumque
> nummi opus - atque opus fit.
> . . . .
> crisabit ut si frumentum clunibus vannat.

The fragments cited above which deal with sexual matters seem to indicate that Lucilius in his poetry (but not necessarily in his own life) advocated the avoidance of emotional entanglements and the employment of safe and uncomplicated means of sexual satisfaction, thus conforming to the views expressed in the diatribe. In his statements concerning marriage, which amount to a humorous polemic (cf. Oltramare, p. 93), Lucilius also is in accord with the Cynic-Stoic diatribes which urged that the wise man never marry (theme 73, Oltramare, p. 60; cf. Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1 on this theme in Lucilius) and that he live without a family (theme 73b, Oltramare, p. 60). The second satire of book 26, which deals with the advantages and disadvantages of marriage (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 83), with emphasis on the latter, provides the best example of the employment of these diatribal themes by Lucilius. The opinions delivered within satire 2, incidentally, seem to be assigned by the poet to an old friend who describes his situation to Lucilius (cf. Krenkel, I, p. 83; Warmington, III, p. 205). The speaker complains, for example, about (Krenkel, fr. 633; Warmington, III, fr. 639)

> coniugem infidamque, pathicam familiam, inpuram domum,

and laments that (Krenkel, fr. 634-635; cf. Oltramare, p. 93)

> homines ipsi hanc sibi molestiam ultro atque aerumnam
> offerunt,
> ducunt uxores, producunt, quibus haec faciant, liberos.565

Further, Lucilius' friend describes his wife as (Krenkel, fr. 639-640; cf. Krenkel, I, p. 84; cf. Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1),

> depoclassere aliqua sperans me ac deargentassere,
> decalauticare, eburno speculo despeculassere,

and declares, allegedly firmly, (Krenkel, fr. 641-642),

> ferri tantum, si roget me, non dem, quantum auri petit;
> si secubitet, si quoque a me, quae roget, non impetret.

Despite these disagreements, however, the husband, because of the decree of Metellus the censor concerning the purpose of marriage (see footnote 565), declares (Krenkel, fr. 643),

> quapropter deliro et cupidi officium fungor liberum,[566]

rounding off a picture that is anything but favorable to marriage. The fragments which have been quoted here from satire 2, then, do reflect the view that marriage and children are best avoided if one wants a happy life, but the emphasis on producing children as a duty is obviously a topical Roman touch added to the Cynic-Stoic commonplaces by the poet. One should note further concerning this satire that although the themes involved do occur in the diatribal tradition, they are not confined to it, as a cursory glance at the treatment of marriage in Greek and Roman comedy, for example, will indicate.[568] Thus, while the poet may have taken over his themes concerning marriage from the diatribal tradition, which seems likely in view of his use of other themes prominent in the Cynic-Stoic genre, one cannot exclude the possibility that another source, such as comedy, was tapped by Lucilius, especially in view of his fondness for parodies of drama.

To the themes which have been discussed must be added those dealing, perhaps in a polemic fashion, with the views of various philosophical schools or with philosophy in general. Lucilius begins his work, for instance, with the line (Krenkel, fr. 1)

XUM

Aetheris et terrae genitabile quaerere tempus,

which Warmington interprets (III, p. 3) as "Lucilius disclaims physical philosophy. . .," and which may connect the poet with the diatribal tradition which stressed the importance of ethics and urged the abandonment of the study of physical phenomena (theme 4, Oltramare, p. 45). Other verses provide examples of the rejection by the poet of the views of certain schools. Fragments 1249-1250 (Krenkel), for example, state (cf. Oltramare, p. 92, footnote 2),

. . .nondum etiam <qui> haec omnia habebit,
formonsus dives liber rex solus feretur,

concerning which Porphyrion observes, "porro autem Stoici existimant perfectae sapientae virum omnia habere . . .," and, after quoting these lines, adds ". . . qui tamen poeta non simpliciter hoc, sed per derisum Stoicorum dicit. . ." (quoted here from Krenkel, pp. 660-662, introduction to fr. ;249-1250). To these lines by Lucilius should be compared Varro's ridicule of the Stoic sage (fr. 245), whom he describes as, "solus rex, solus rhetor, solus formonsus, fortis, aecus vel ad aediliceum modium, purus putus: si ad hunc χαρακτῆρας Κλεάνθους conveniet, cave attigeris hominem. . .," probably following Menippus or another Cynic source and also possibly influenced by the remarks of Lucilius quoted above. Polemics and ridicule directed against other schools also seem to have formed part of the third satire of book 28 where Lucilius, writing of a "philosophical banquet" (Krenkel, I, p. 90), says,

adde eodem, tristis ac severus philosophus,

by which he probably refers to the Academic Xenocrates (Krenkel, p. 431), and then begins remarks concerning other philosophers with the statement (Krenkel, fr. 772-773; cf. Oltramare, p. 92, footnote 2 on the polemics in this satire),

XUM

> Polemon et amavit, morte huic transmisit suam
> scolen quam dicunt. . .,

and the wish (Krenkel, fr. 774),

> eidola atque atomus vincere Epicuri volam.

One cannot be sure whether the poet developed any of these remarks into an actual polemic, but the spirit of ridicule, however mild, definitely is present. Perhaps to these should be added the comment (Krenkel, fr. 500-501, from book 15),

> paenula, si quaeris cantherius, servus, segestre
> utilior mihi quam sapiens. . .,

which Krenkel assigns to the satire in which the fable of the ant appears (see above before footnote 507), but which still can be seen as a humorous remark pointing out the allegedly greater value of things of practical use as opposed to the value of the wise man of any philosophical school. All of these fragments which deal humorously with the sage or with tenets and figures of various philosophies seem to connect Lucilius with the Cynic tradition of polemic which has been noted above (see at footnotes 324, 330, 350) and perhaps also with the Cynic Menippus in view of the similarity of theme found in fragments 1249-1250 of Lucilius and in fragment 245 of Varro, the Roman imitator of Menippus.

As a result of the investigation of the style and themes of Lucilius' satires which has been conducted within this study some relationship between the Roman poet and the Cynic-Stoic tradition of popular philosophy seems to have been established. Each of the traits and each of the themes that has been mentioned, as has been noted above, often can be assigned individually to some other source, such as the poet's own experiences or education. The aggregate of rhetorical devices and figures, parodies, fables, references to mythological figures (and especially to Tantalus), simple comparisons involving medicine or commonplace scenes, character sketches, proverbs, spoudaiogeloion, and various Cynic-Stoic themes, however, bears too strong a resemblance to the composition and topics of the diatribe for that similarity to be accidental. Further, although the traits which have been listed are found scattered throughout the fragments of Lucilius and are not grouped together within one work, as they are in a single diatribe, still the total effect produced by their use within each book of satires and finally within the whole collection of Lucilius' poems is that of a medley of various devices similar to that found in the diatribal style (cf. Van Rooy, p. 52 on the Lucilian "medley").[569]

With this discussion of Lucilius and the diatribe ends the investigation of the diatribe prior to Lucretius. The various sections dealing with Greek and Roman writers have shown that the Cynic-Stoic genre had a far-reaching effect which was not limited to prose, as the presence of diatribal traits and themes in the poetry of Lucilius, Varro, and Horace, and possibly also in Ennius, indicates (see also J. Geffcken, op. cit., on the diatribe and the Hellenistic poets).[570] Further, although it is referred to in this study, and commonly in others, as the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, the genre is not limited entirely to those two schools, since the Epicurean Philodemus and the Peripatetic Ariston of Ceos also employed the genre, although possibly in a modified and more formal way (see above after footnote 312). One should not be surprised, then, to find traces of this mixed genre in the work of an Epicurean epic poet such as Lucretius, who, as the following chapter will show, employed various devices and themes commonly found in the diatribe as another means of fulfilling his didactic purpose (see above after footnote 5 ff. and Chapter IV below).

XUM

Footnotes

1. Helmut Rahn, Morphologie der Antiken Literatur, Eine Einführung (Darmstadt, 1969), p. 153.

2. G. C. Fiske, Lucilius and Horace (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 7, Madison, 1920), p. 179. The possible translations "pastime" and "discourse" also should be noted; cf. Stephanus on diatribē for other references; cf. Rahn, op. cit.; p. 153.

3. Cf. W. Capelle, "Diatribe," Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, 3 (1957), col. 991 ff.; cf. Rahn, op. cit., p. 154.

4. D. R. Dudley, A History of Cynicism (London, 1937), p. 110.

5. Ibid., p. 110. Cf. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 27, ed. H. S. Long (Oxford, 1963). All references to Diogenes Laertius will be taken from this edition.

6. E. J. Kenney, ed., Lucretius, De rerum natura, III (Cambridge, 1971), p. 17.

7. C. A. van Rooy, Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory (Leiden, 1966), p. 34. See also Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos von Karystos (in Philologische Untersuchungen, Berlin, 1880), pp. 306-307 and his Die Griechische Literatur des Altertums (in Die Griechische and Lateinische Literatur und Sprache, in the series Die Kultur der Gegenwart, I, VIII, Berlin, 1912), p. 164 (quoted by C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., pp. 109-110); G. Schmidt, "Diatribai," in Der Kleine Pauly II (Stuttgart, 1967), col. 1577.

   One should add here that the diatribe can be considered a type of epideictic oratory perhaps akin to the declamation, concerning which see T. Burgess, Epideictic Literature, in Studies in Classical Philology, III (Chicago, 1902), 235.

8. Oswyn Murray, "Philodemus on the Good King According to Homer," JRS, 55 (1965), 173.

   Rudolf Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 13, Göttengen, 1910), pp. 10-64 has an excellent discussion of the style of the diatribe. This work, unfortunately, was unavailable to me until I had finished this study.

XUM

9. The other uses of the word diatribe listed in C. J. Vooys, Lexicon Philodemeum (Purmerend, 1934), must be translated as "pastimes" or "schools."

10. Cf. E. J. Kenney, op. cit., p. 17; G. C. Fiske, op. cit., p. 180; D. R. Dudley, op. cit., p. 111; F. Susemihl, Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur in der Alexanderzeit, I (Leipzig, 1891), 36 (criticised by T. Burgess, op. cit., p. 235). All of these authorities unfortunately quote only the first six words of Hermogenes' definition, apparently not noticing the importance of the rest. One can use those six words as a brief definition of the essence of the diatribe, as long as one removes them from their context, and realizes that Hermogenes is defining something different from the genre under discussion in this study.

11. Hermogenes, Peri methodou deinotetos, ed. H. Rabe (Teubner, 1913, rep. 1969), 5, p. 418.

12. Cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, ed. Harry Caplan (Loeb, 1954), IV, L. 63, for the definition of ethopoiia or character delineation. This edition will be the source for all quotations from, and references to, this work. The edition by F. Marx, 2nd. ed. with additions by W. Trillitzsch (Teubner, 1964) also has been consulted.

13. Ibid., IV, XLII. 54. Another figure, commoratio, ibid., IV, XLV. 58, also is involved here. Cf. Aristotle's use of the plural diatribas in Ars Rhetorica, 1418 a 27. These figures can be part of a diatribe but they do not define it.

14. Demosthenes, Peri tou stephanou (ed. S. H. Butcher and W. Rennie, Oxford), 1-8.

15. Hermogenes, op. cit., 5, p. 417.

16. The entry diatribē in Stephanus has been very useful for a survey of references to the term.

17. Aulus Gellius (ed. P. K. Marshall, Oxford, 1968), 18.13; see also 17.20 and 1.26.

18. Athenaeus (ed. G. Kaibel, Teubner, 1890), XI, 508c; cf. Susemihl, op. cit., p. 36.

19. Ibid., XI, 508d.

20. Diogenes Laertius, VI, 1.

XUM

21. *Ibid.*, II, 84; cf. Susemihl, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

22. Cf. *Apology*, 37d; *Charmides*, Ia; cf. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

23. Susemihl, *op. cit.*, p. 36; cf. T. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

Rudolf Hirzel, *Der Dialog*, I, (Leipzig, 1895), p. 369, note 2, comments, "die dialogische Form leugnet Susemihl Alex. Liter. I S. 36, 105 ohne genügenden Grund. Dass die Diatriben nicht mit den Chrien verwechselt werden dürfen, ist schon aus dem Schriftenverzeichniss Aristipps klar, wo (Diog. II 85)

Διατριβῶν ἕξ neben χρειῶν τρία stehen;

auch Persaios, Kleanthes, Ariston (Diog. VII 163) hatten sowohl Chrien als Diatriben verfasst."

24. Diogenes Laertius, II, 77. Diogenes also mentions works attributed to Ariston of Ceos (VII, 2.160) which he calls *diatribai*, some of these are called *erotikai diatribai*.

25. See especially André Oltramare, *Les Origines de la Diatribe Romaine* (Lausanne, 1926), pp. 1-65.

26. Helmut Rahn, *op. cit.*, p. 156. Other scholars have also expressed their doubts about the existence of the genre or about the validity of the use of the term *diatribe*. As G. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, col. 1577, notes, the term came into use among scholars because of the descriptive comments of H. Usener who wrote in the "Praefatio" to his *Epicurea* (p. LXIX), "scilicet postquam Bio Borysthenita sermonibus suis (διατριβαί nomen erat) genus cynicum severitate risuque mixtum perfecit, exstiterunt qui iam non praecepta moralia facetiis condirent sed quasi poetae tum philosophos ipsos ridicula persona ornatos exprimerent tum eorum opiniones ridendas exponerent, cynici Menippus et Meleager Gadarenses et si qui eorum similes fuerunt." A few other scholars have since questioned the use of *diatribe*. For example, H. Throm, *Die Thesis* (Rhetorische Studien, 17, Paderborn, 1932) p. 191. (cf. G. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, col. 1578) suggested that the term *thesis* be substituted, while R. Philippson, in his favorable review of A. Oltramare, *Les Origines de la Diatribe Romaine*, in *Gnomon* (1927), p. 728 (cf. G. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, col. 1578) mentions (and rejects) the substitution of the term *scholae* (see also H. Throm, *op. cit.*, p. 191 and R. Hirzel, *Op. cit.*, I, pp. 525-526 and note 1 on p. 526). One perhaps should conclude, as G. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, col. 1578, does,

"Zusammenhänge der ant. populärphilos. Lit. ist der Begriff D., der sich eingebürgert hat. . ., zweifellos nützlich, doch sollte er nicht im Sinne eines festumrissenen Genos verwendet und nicht . . .zu weit gedehnt werden." See also Ernst Günther Schmidt, "Diatribe und Satire," *Römische Satire* (*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock*, Gesellschafts-und-Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 15, 1966), pp. 507 ff. This study will be cited hereafter as Schmidt, Rostock.

27. See Oltramare, *op. cit.*, passim.

28. E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, I, (Leipzig, 1909), p. 129; cf. T. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 235, who also quotes Norden. See also R. Hirzel, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 371-372 and note 2.

29. J. Andrieu, *Le Dialogue Antique* (Collection d'Etudes Latines, 29, Paris, 1954), p. 306, note 1; cf. C. W. Mendell, "Satire as Popular Philosophy," *CP* 15 (1920), p. 142.

30. W. Capelle, "Diatribe," col. 992. The growing use of formalized rhetoric and the development of rhetorical schools during the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.E. definitely are a factor in the development of the diatribe; cf. A. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-14.

31. One, of course, may discount the remark of Theopompus that Plato's dialogues were taken from the works of others.

32. M. Puelma Piwonka, *op. cit.*, p. 179, mentions "die als Vorstufe zur 'Diatribe' wichtigen Formen des Mimus." Cf. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 393 and footnotes 471 and 472 of the present study. On the mime, cf. Helmut Wiemken, *Der Griechische Mimus*, *Dokuments zur Geschichte des antiken Volkstheaters* (Bremen, 1972).

33. W. Capelle, *op. cit.*, col. 990-991. Capelle discusses the change from city state to Macedonian control which removed the average citizen from his accustomed political participation. Cf. C. W. Mendell, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-141.

34. C. W. Mendell, *op. cit.*, p. 141; cf. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 141. See also F. Susemihl, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 10-11.

36. Cf. Farrand Sayre, *Diogenes of Sinope* (Baltimore, 1938), passim. Antisthenes of course, seems to have had considerable influence on Diogenes and later Cynics, and he is often considered the founder of Cynicism because of this influence. For a discussion of his

XUM

views, see J. M. Rist, Stoic Philosophy (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 54 ff., and Léon Robin, La Pensée Grecque et les Origines de l'Esprit Scientifique (L'Evolution de L'Humanité, Bibliotheque de Synthèse Historique, XIII, Paris, 1963) pp. 199-202; cf. Diogenes Laertius, VI, 1.

One should note here that in the case of Diogenes and the earliest Cynics, as U. Knoche, Die Römische Satire (Göttingen, 1957), p. 36, states, "ürsprunglich war die Diatribe des Kynikers nur für die bestimmt, die gerade anwesend waren." Of course, the nature of these early "diatribes" is uncertain, and one can assume only that Diogenes and his immediate followers spoke publicly on virtue and vice, perhaps using examples from daily life (cf. the examples of Diogenes' comments given by Diogenes Laertius, VI, 20 ff.) such as the later diatribe, as developed by Bion, used. Many of the sayings attributed to Antisthenes and Diogenes seem to have become commonplaces of the diatribe; cf. Oltramare, op. cit., pp. 44-65.

Diogenes Laertius mentions no diatribes by Diogenes of Sinope, but he does record (VI, 80) a list of dialogues and tragedies attributed to Diogenes with doubts concerning their authenticity.

37. Diogenes Laertius, VI, 69; cf. J. M. Rist, op. cit., p. 58, who cites and comments upon this passage. See Plutarch, Moralia, 69C (Quomodo adulator ab amico internoscatur) on Crates and parrhesia; cf. Hermann Diels, ed., Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta (Poetarum Graecorum Fragmenta, III, part 1, Berlin, 1901), p. 213.

38. Diogenes Laertius, VII, 2-5 and IV, 51; cf. W. Capelle, op. cit. col. 991, cf. Otto Hense, "Prolegomena," in his Teletis Reliquiae (2nd. ed., 1909, rep. Hildesheim, 1969), pp. cxxi-cxxiii on Crates and Bion.

39. According to Susemihl, op. cit., I, p. 30, these verses are some of the "kleine satirische und moralische Gedichte

theils in Hexametern, theils in elegischen Distichen, theils in Trimetern, in welchen die Parodie, und zwar in den hexametrischen natürlich die homerische, eine Hauptralle spielte," for which Crates is known. Cf. Ibid., p. 39, on his influence on Bion. See also L. Rademacher, Weinen und Lachen, Studien über antikes Lebensgefühl (Wien, 1947).

For other examples of Crates' poetry, see H. Diels, Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta, pp. 216-223. In these fragments one sees some of the same figures which appear in the prose fragment of Crates preserved by Teles, pp. 49 ff, which will be discussed presently. For example, frg. 4 shows homoeoptoton (1.1), polysyndeton (1.5), and alliteration (1.6 and 7). Frg. 5 also features obvious alliteration and homoeoptoton, while frg. 7, with homoeoteleuton (1.2) and alliteration (1.1), and frg. 10, with asyndeton (1.9) and homoeoptoton (1.11) also show Crates' fondness for certain rhetorical figures. One should note, also, the use of isocolon in frg. 13.

40. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

41. Mary A. Grant, *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 21, Madison, 1924), p. 56, says this concerning Crates. Demetrius, *Peri hermeneias* (V, 261; ed. L. Rademacher, 1901, rep. 1907, Teubner), aptly comments, καὶ ὅλως, συνελόντι φράσαι, πᾶν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ κυνικοῦ λόγου σαίνοντι ἅμα ἔοικέ τῳ καὶ δάκοντι."

42. See, for example, Bion in Teles, ed. O. Hense (as cited above; this edition will be the source for all quotations from, and references to, Teles, and fragments of other writers preserved by him, and will be cited only in Teles, with a page and line numbered. On Crates' *Paignia* and Bion, see Susemihl, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

43. Teles, pp. 49 ff. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 45-46 translates and briefly comments on this passage, observing (p. 45) that it is ". . .an attack on Hedonist doctrines. . . ." On Teles' life and works see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonas*, pp. 292-319.

44. For an excellent discussion of the principles of ring composition see B. A. van Gronigen, *La Composition Littéraire Archaïque Grecque* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, LXV, no. 2, Amsterdam, 1958), pp. 51-53 and passim.

45. See Bion in Teles, pp. 6-8, and Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 50. See Also Hense, "Prolegomena," p. cxxii on the similarity of themes and the question of Teles' use of Crates at first hand.

46. See *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xxx.41, for a definition and examples. Hense, "Prolegomena," p. C, discusses asyndeton in Bion.

47. For other examples, see Teles p. 50.5-6 and 50.14. According to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xiii.19, anaphora or *repetitio*

XUM

occurs ". . .cum continenter ab uno atque eodem verbo in rebus similibus et diversis principia sumuntur. . . ."

48. The quotations from Demetrius, Peri hermeneias, have been taken from the edition by L. Radermacher, all quotations from Quintilian are from the Teubner edition by L. Radermacher.

It has been necessary to describe these two figures at length here to establish firmly the distinction between them which will be observed in this study and which is not always observed by modern scholars. See, for example, Wilhelm Knögel, Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem (Leipzig, 1933; p. 53) who groups both figures under the single heading "Homoioteleuta." The definitions given in the Rhetorica ad Herennium IV, xx.28 for homoeopototon ("Similiter cadens exornatio appellatur cum in eadem constructione verborum duo aut plura sunt verba quae similiter isdem casibus efferantur. . . .") and homoeoteleuton ("Similiter desinens est cum, tametsi casus non sunt in verbus, tamen similes exitus sunt. . . .") are clear enough but insufficient without augmentation. Further, although the definitions to be followed are later than the works under consideration (Crates, Bion, etc.), one still can use these terms if the figures exist in the early writers, especially if one considers the conservative nature of the ancient rhetorical tradition (Cf. G. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, 1963) p. 270). On these figures cf. Heinrich Lausberg, Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik (München, 1960), pp. 361-364; J. D. Denniston, Greek Prose Style (Oxford, 1952, rep. 1965), p. 134; E. Norden, op. cit., II, p. 847. Leonid Arbusow, Colores Rhetorici (Göttingen, 2nd ed. by Helmut Peter, 1963), pp. 75-76.

49. For another example, see Teles, p. 50.8 and p. 50.10. See Hense, "Prolegomena," p. C ff., and H. von Müller, De Teletis elocutione, Freiburg, 1891), p. 73, on this figure in Bion and Teles.

50. See Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xx.27 on isocolon. E. Norden, op. cit., I, p. 130, mentions Bion's use of short sentences. See context to note 113 below on isocolon in Bion.

51. See, for example, Teles, pp. 30.4 ff.

52. Plutarch, Moralia, 600 F (De exilio; ed. W. R. Paton et. al., III, Teubner, 1929 rep. 1972); cf. F. Susemihl, op. cit., p. 30, who notes that the lines of Crates ". . .allem Anscheine nach gleichen Ursprunges mit denen sind welche Plut. de exil. 5.600 F aus einer Tragödie Herakles, ohne Nennung des Dichters anführt." For another

XUM

example, see Demetrius, V, 259, a parody of Homer, *Odyssey* XIX, 172. See also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die griechische Literatur*, p. 99.

53. On the Cynic idea of autarkeia see D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.* on Diogenes and others, pp. 17-58.

54. F. Susemihl, op. cit., p. 30 notes that the letters ascribed to Crates are of doubtful authenticity. Diogenes Laertius, VI, 98, says,
"Φέρεται δὲ τοῦ Κράτητος βιβλίον Ἐπιστολαί, ἐν αἱς ἄριστα φιλοσοφεῖ, τὴν λέξιν ἔστιν ὅτε παραπλήσιος πλάτωνι."

Cf. A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, tr. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer (London, 2nd. ed., 1966), p. 670.

55. On Stilpon, cf. Diogenes Laertius, II, 113 ff.

56. Diogenes Laertius also records an incident in which Crates tried to pull Zeno, by the cloak, away from Stilpon, but Zeno reminded Crates that persuasion was the only way to get him away from his new teacher. (Diogenes Laertius, VII, 24).

57. Diogenes Laertius, II, 111-112; cf. Benson Mates, *Stoic Logic*, (University of California Press, Berkeley, Paper-bound edition, 1961; originally vol. 26 of University of California Publications in Philosophy, Berkeley, 1953), pp. 5-7, on Diodorus Cronus, and on the influence of the Megarian school.

58. Cf. Hense in the "Prolegomena" to his Teles edition, pp. xlix-li ff. and cxxiii ff., U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos*, pp. 302-306, and F. Susemihl, *op. cit.*, p. 38, note 108e.

Hense says "Stilponem ab ipso Telete lectum esse probabile puto," and does not believe that Teles took this quotation at second hand from Bion. R. Hirzel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 368, note 4, on the other hand, feels that Teles would not have read the dialogue of Stilpon since they were "in geringem Ansehen," but rather must have taken this quotation from some *Stilponis apomnemoneumata*.while it is possible that Teles used such a collection, it also is not impossible that he read the works of Stilpon, even if they were as badly written as Hirzel thinks, or that he took a quotation from Bion.

59. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos*, p. 306.

60. Hense, *op. cit.*, pp. xlix ff., sees the *phasin* in this way and notes in his *apparatus* on p. 23, "adferri puto opinionem vulgarem, fortasse ut adversarii sint verba. . . . Stilponem subaudiri. . . uetant verba proxima." He does not mention the ring composition. The ὁρῶ, of course, could refer to Teles. The present writer, however, accepts Hense's conclusions.

61. Another example is found in the question (Teles, p. 22.4) "ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀνδρείας ἢ δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἄλλης τινὸς ἀρετῆς;" See also Teles, p. 22.2. Another type of parallellism occurs in

"ἐπιφανέστερα γεγονότα φυγάδων γενομένων"

(Teles, p. 22.9).

62. See Hense's apparatus for identification. The Homeric lines (ed. D. B. Munro and T. W. Allen, Oxford) read as follows:

"Φθίην δ' ἐξικόμην ἐριβώλακα, μητέρα μήλων,
καί μ' ἀφνειὸν ἔθηκε, πολὺν δέ μοι ὤπασε λαόν "

The first line has not been changed enough to be considered a parody.

63. Cf. Teles, p. 51.1-2, the verse quoted by Crates, and Teles, p. 22.12, the verse quoted by Stilpon.

64. Cf. G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, pp. 61-68 and *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, p. 298, note a; E. Norden, op. cit., I, pp. 16-29.

65. B. A. van Groningen, *La Composition Littéraire Archaïque Grecque*, pp. 51-53, and passim.

66. See footnote 58. The brief reference to Stilpon (cf. p. 59.11) possibly was taken over from Bion, although Teles could have taken this at first hand also. cf. Hense, *op. cit.*, p. cxxiv.

67. Teles, p. 6.8 ff. This section will be discussed in more detail later in the chapter.

68. See note 58.

69. Diogenes Laertius, VII, 5 and 10; cf. Max Polenz. *Die Stoa, Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung* (Göttingen, 1848), I, 24; Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. I, *Greece and Rome*, *Part II* (New York, 1946; revised Image Books edition 1962), p. 129.

XUM

70. Diogenes Laertius, VII, 4 lists these and other titles.

71. Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrh. hypotyp., III, 245 and 190-191; H. von Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta (Teubner, 1905; rep. 1968), I, p. 59 includes these fragments.

72. Sextus Empiricus, Kata ethikous, 190 (ed. J. Mau Teubner, 1961).

73. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxv.34; cf. H. Lausberg, op. cit. I, pp. 315-317.

74. See Diogenes Laertius VII, 4 and 42 ff. See also von Arnim (hereafter abbreviated as SVF), op. cit., I, pp. 21-23.

75. See, for example, the discussion of the relationship between Oedipus and Jocasta in Sextus Empiricus, Κατὰ ἠθικούς 191. This parrhesia may be due to Cynic influence on Zeno. For a discussion of the relationship between Cynicism and Stoicism, see J. M. Rist, op. cit., pp. 54-80.

76. Cf. A. Oltramare, op. cit., pp. 19-20 and Diogenes Laertius, VI, 91.

77. Cf. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 46 and G. C. Fiske, op. cit., p. 178. Much of this story, supposedly told by Bion himself, sounds like a hostile exaggeration;; cf. D. R. Dudley, op. cit., p. 64.

78. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 52; cf. W. Capelle, op. cit., col. 995, and H. von Arnim,"Bion," RE III (1897) col. 483, who comments that "Einer bestimmten Schulphilosophie kann er als Popularphilosoph nicht zugerechnet werden, da zum Wesen der Popularphilosophie ein nach Principien gesunden Menschenverstandes geübter Eklekticismus gehört." Cf. also G. C. Fiske, op. cit., pp. 179 and 185; C. A. Van Rooy, op. cit., p. 109.

79. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 52; cf. T. Burgess, op. cit. p. 236.

Strabo, I, 22 (ed. G. Aujac, Paris, 1969) also mentions the comment of Eratosthenes, and comments as follows: " Ὁ δ᾽Ἀρχεσίλαον καὶ Ἀρίστωνα τῶν καθ᾽αὑτὸν ἀνθησάντων κορυφαίους τίθησιν, Ἀπελλῆς τε αὐτῷ πολύς έστι καὶ Βίων, ὅν φησι πρῶτον ἀνθινὰ περιβαλεῖν φιλοσοφίαν, ἀλλ᾽ὅμως πολλάκις εἰπεῖν ἄν τινα ἐπ᾽αὐτοῦ τοῦτο οἵην ἐκ ῥακέων ὁ Βίων.

80. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, pp. 189 ff.

81. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 34; cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos*, p. 307.

82. Cf. Van Rooy, p. 30, for comments on the influences which may go into the formation of a new genre. Van Rooy uses the development of the satura at Rome as his example. Possibly the relationship of the work of Bion and Crates is similar to that of Lucilius and Ennius.

83. Hense's first edition of Teles (Teubner, 1889) includes a comprehensive index which not only lists (as does the second edition) the ancient authors who quote or imitate Bion but also attempts to separate the remnants of Bion from the additions of his student Teles with the fragments of Teles' diatribes preserved in Stobaeus, *Ecl.* II, 15 and *Flor.* passim (cf. Hense, *op. cit.*, p. x ff.). The present writer has used the indices of both editions (1889 and 1909, rep. 1968), but the second edition is the source for all quotations from, and references to, Bion and Teles.

The styles of Bion and Teles, of course, can be discussed together if necessary, since Teles seems to have relied heavily on his teacher (cf. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 85) and therefore may be assumed to reflect his general style, just as Bion reflects some characteristics of his teacher Crates. Cf. G. C. Fiske. *op. cit.*, p. 200, who refers to "Bion-Teles."

84. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 110. See also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die griech. Literatur*, p. 100 who notes concerning Bion's work ". . .die Belustigung überwiegt leicht. . . ."

85. Mary A. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 56; see also G. Gerhard, ed., *Phoinix von Kolophon*, p. 230, note 6 (Teubner, 1909) to whom Grant also refers: Cf. Lawrence Giangrande, *The Use of Spoudaiogeloion in Greek and Roman Literature* (Studies in Classical Literature, 6, the Hague, 1972) pp. 8-10 and 16-31. This study, which became available to me only after I had completed this chapter on the diatribe, contains a section entitled "Various forms of Spoudaiogeloion" which lists the *ainos*, the *chreia*, the *mime*, the character sketch, and parody as manifestations of spoudaiogeloion.

XUM

On page 10 (lines 3-5) Giangrande paraphrases, without proper acknowledgement, the description of *spoudaiogeloion* given by Mary A. Grant on page 56. He follows the same procedure on page 99 where he says, concerning Bion and the diatribe, "he adopted the literary form which derived from the philosophic treatise, the public speech, the schoolsession and the dialogue (all the ingredients of the diatribe)." This obviously is taken, without acknowledgement, from van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 109: "it is the cosmopolis of the Hellenistic world, where popular philosophers, particularly Cynics, frequently travelled from city to city, and employed a mixed genre the diatribe, which was derived from the philosophic treatise, the oration, the school-lesson and the dialogue. . . ." I call the reader's attention to the change of "oration" to "public speech," and of "school-lesson" to "schoolsession!" To these examples should be added Giangrande's statement (on page 27), "*Charaktêrismos*, the minute delineation of satiric types of character, is a tendency, originally apparent in Bion of Borysthenes, which gathers momentum in New Comedy. Aristotle's *Ethics*, and Theophrastus' writings. This characterisization of weak types permeates all literature of the *spoudaiogeloion* variety. . .," which is an obvious plagiarism of the following passage from G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace*, p. 186:

> In what is somewhat pedantically, but conveniently called χαρακτηρισμός, that is in the minute delineation of satiric types of character, Bion is an adept. This tendency, which started with the New Comedy, the Ethics of Aristotle, and the Characters of Theophrastus, came to pervade nearly all the forms of literature conceived in the half-humorous, half-serious spirit of τὸ σπουδαιογέλοιον."

It is amusing to note that Giangrande has confused the chronology correctly given by Fiske and has placed Bion *before* Aristotle and Theophrastus.

86. Cf. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 181, and Cicero, Tusc. III, 26.62. Several other examples are found in Diogenes Laertius IV, 48-50. For instance, according to Diogenes Laertius, IV, 48, Bion "τὸ γῆρας ἔλεγεν ὅρμον εἶναι τῶν κακῶν· εἰς αὐτὸ γοῦν πάντα καταφεύγειν." This statement is not necessarily taken from a diatribe, but it does serve to illustrate the tone of Bion's work.

87. Plutarch, *Moralia*, 536A (ed. W. R. Paton et al., III, Teubner, 1929, rep. 1972). L. Radermacher, *op. cit.* (*Weinen*), p. 122, comments, "Da die Griechen auch die Henkel der Krüge "Ohren" genannt haben, so vergleich Bion, wie uns Plutarch erzählt, die Menschen, die sich von Schmeichlern beeinflussen lassen, mit Krügen, die man an ihren Ohren hin und her dreht.

Such a tone, of course, is not limited to the Cynics or to the diatribe. Demetrius, *Peri hermeneias*, 262, notes that it occurs in the orators and says that Lysias, for example, once said

"πρὸς τὸν ἐρῶντα τῆς γραὸς" that "'ἧς ῥᾷον ἦν ἀριθμῆσαι τοὺς ὀδόντας ἢ τοὺς δακτύλους.'"

88. Teles, pp. 18.8 ff; cf. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 183 who also mentions the anecdote. See also Fiske, pp. 168-162 and Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata*, 3.

89. See, for example, the references to Laertes and Tantalus in Teles, p. 34.6 ff.

90. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

91. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 51. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 186 cites the "chatterer" and the miser (Diogenes Laertius, IV, 50) as examples.

92. Cf. Diogenes Laertius VI, 5 who records remarks by Antisthenes which resemble this type of sketch; Theophrastus,

Χαρακτῆρες, XXVIII, and G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

93. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 52; cf. T. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 236. The homeric line is from the edition of Munro and Allen cited earlier.

94. Teles, p. 30.4 ff.; cf. Hense's apparatus for identification. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 183 notes Bion's use of verse citations. Other examples are found throughout the fragments of Teles, as, for example, pp. 31.4-34.1 ff., 35.1.

It has been suggested by Prof. L. Wallach that a study of the verse citations in Bion and Crates should be undertaken to determine whether quotations were taken directly from the authors or whether some collection of excerpts or a gnomologicum could have been used.

XUM

95. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 188. Fiske, unfortunately, cites only the Roman Persius as an example of a later diatribe writer and gives no other Latin or Greek examples of this use of *phesin* or the equivalent which has come to be something of a trademark of the diatribe for modern scholars. (cf. Kenney, *op. cit.*, p. 18; W. Capelle, *op. cit.*, col. 992, D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 111). Oltramare, op. cit., p. 11, however, does cite examples from later writers, especially Plutarch and Maximius of Tyre, which may serve to indicate the change from the slight use of dialogue to the mere expression of φησίν . E. Norden, *op. cit.*, I, p. 129 ff. and II, pp. 506 and 556 ff. discusses the use of *phesin* in the diatribe style and in the works of Paul, such as Corinthians, II, 10, 10,

"'αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ μὲν ,' φησίν', βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί, ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενὴς καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένος.'"

Norden refers to the φησίν here as "einige Ausgaben absurd φησίν ." See also R. Hirzel, *op. cit.*, p. 417 (commented on by H. Throm, *op. cit.*, p. 10).

H. Throm, *Die Thesis*, p. 10, in contrast to Norden, says "Rein formal-stilistische Kriterien, wie man z. B. fur die "diatribische" Form das " φησί "usurpiert, scheiden dabei von vornherein aus: der Stil an sich ist etwas viel zu Individuelles als dass er eine literarische Gattung begründen könnte." While Throm may be correct in raising objections as far as Bion and the use of *phesin* are concerned (although one might assume that the *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, in Teles (p. 7), is addressed to an imaginary interlocator who has made a complaint), he goes too far in assuming that no diatribal style can be defined, as A. Oltramare's excellent study must show.

96. R. Hirzel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 6, note 1 also quotes this definition. See also his discussion on pp. 2 ff. Cf. Helmut Rahn, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

97. This is vaguely reminiscent of some rapid question and answer sessions in Plato, such as in the *Charmides*, 159c-106b. The artistry, however, is lacking. Perhaps one can see in this section some influence from Stilpon, although the scanty evidence makes that uncertain. Other sections such as Teles, pp. 28 ff., remind one of the dialogue form but are neither strictly dialogues in genre nor definitely from Bion's work.

98. See footnote 95. Perhaps close to this later usage is the statement in Teles, not traceable to Bion, where the change of source seems to be marked by the anonymous comment "

"οὐκ ἄρχουσι , φασίν, οὐ πιστεύονται , οὐ παρρησίαν

ἔχουσιν.
(Teles, p. 23.4). See also the context of footnote 60.

99. See also Teles pp. 18-20. These stories, of course, could have originated in collections of such anecdotes. See G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, pp. 158-162, who discusses the form, use, and popularity of such anecdotes. See also Georg Reichel, *Quaestiones Progymnasticae*, pp. 46-49 (Leipzig, 1909) and G. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, p. 270.

100. W. Capelle, *op. cit.*, col. 992.

101. Teles, p. 16.2 ff.; cf. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 67 who translates this simile. The simile of the feast reminds one of Lucretius, III, 938 and of Horace, *Sermones* I, 1.118-119, as is noticed by R. Heinze, *de Horatio Bionis Imitatore* (Bonn, 1889) p. 21 and by E. J. Kenney, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

For another example, see Teles, ed. Hense, p. 41.6 ff.

102. Teles, p. 6, ff.; cf. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 66, who translates this simile. See G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 223 on Cynic use of "animal similes and fables."

103. See Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica*, 141b620 ff., on the effective type of simile.

104. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, ed. H. Caplan, IV, L11.66; cf. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 184, who uses the term"allegorical personification;" H. Lausberg, *op. cit.*, p. 411 ff.

105. T. Burgess, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-230; cf. E. Norden, *op. cit.*, I, p. 130 on Demetrius of Phaleron. See also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die griech. Literatur*, p. 100.

One should note here the use of personifications by Menander, who used a personification of "Ignorance" to speak the prologue to his *Perikeiromene*. This is mentioned by T. B. L. Webster, "The Comedy of Menander," in *Roman Drama* (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence, ed. T. A. Dorey and D. R. Dudley; 1965) p. 6, and connected with Menander's study of Peripatetic ethics.

XUM

106. Teles, pp. 6 ff. Cf. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 67, who cites and translates this passage; G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 184, especially on the influence of this type of personification on later writers; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos*, p. 297, note 8. *Penia's* attack shows the polemical tone common in later diatribes.

107. Teles, p. 52.1-2. The goddess *Tyche*, herself the personification of an abstract, may be meant here. See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos*, p. 293.

Another possible example of an "incomplete" personification perhaps can be seen in the line "

"τὴν δὲ κατακολουθοῦσαν ὠμὴν φησὶν ἡ δόξα."
(Teles, p. 57.10).

108. On the lack of periodic sentences see E. Norden, *op. cit.*, I, p. 29 (where he mentions "die saloppe Diktion und die Auflösung der Periode in kleine Sätze)." On the use of rhetorical questions, see also W. Capelle, *op. cit.*, col. 993.

109. Teles, p. 7.2-5; cf. E. Norden, *op. cit.*, I, p. 129, who also cites this passage.

110. Another series of rhetorical questions in a passage attributed to Bion is found in Teles, p. 31.6-8. One cannot support a claim of influence from Stilpon in any of the passages cited, since such questions are a common rhetorical device.

111. See also Teles, p. 16.2 ff. See also D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 66, who translates the simile quoted in the context to this note.

112. Teles, pp. 15.11-16.2. Hense uses this example in his "Prolegomena," p.C; cf. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 68. Cf. note 50 and its context on isocolon in Crates.

113. Hense, "Prolegomena," p. C. For other examples of asyndeton, see H. von Müller, *De Teletis elocutione*, pp. 70 ff., and Teles, pp. 8.7-8 (". . . τὸ γῆρας, τὴν πενίαν, τὸν ἀπαντήσαντα, τὴν ἡμέραν, τὴν ὥραν, τὸν τόπον."),

and 41.15 ff. (" ὅταν δὲ ποιήσας ἀλαζόνα πολυτελῆ δεισιδαίμονα δοξοκόπον ἄπληστον χρήματα πολλὰ διδῷς, οὐδὲν περανεῖς.")
Polysyndeton also occurs; cf. von Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-72 and Teles, pp. 11.8 and 43.10-11.

XUM

Other examples of isocolon also can be noted, such as

"σὺ μὲν ἄρχεις καλῶς, ἐγὼ δὲ ἄρχομαι. . ."
(Teles, p. 6.1) and Teles, p. 4 passim. Hense, "Prolegomena," p. C, lists examples in Teles, pp. 6.12, 7.4, 7.8.

114. Cf. G. Schmidt, "Diatribai," col. 1577; Hense, "Prolegomena," p. C; W. Capelle, op. cit., col. 993.

115. A third example of antithesis is found in Plutarch Moralia, 965 A-B (ed. C. Hubert, Teubner, VI.I, 1954) where he notes,

"ὁ Βίων ἔλεγε τὰ παιδάρια παίζοντα Τῶν βατράχων τοῖς λίθοις ἐφίεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ βατράχους μηκέτι παίζοντας ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς ἀποθνῄσκειν. . . ."

116. The Crates quotation in Teles also abounds in these figures, but it is difficult to prove influence on the sole basis of rhetorical figures with which both authors undoubtedly were independently familiar.

Another good example occurs in Teles, p. 16.4 ff., with the repetition of eu kai.

117. This last figure bears some resemblance to the figure traductio ". . .quae facit uti, cum idem verbum crebrius ponatur, non modo non offendat animum, sed etiam concinniorem orationem reddat. . ." (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xiv.20).

Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xx.28, notes that homoeoptoton and homoeoteleuton often are used together, as they are here.

118. The use of adverbs with similar endings here may be considered homoeoteleuton, if the distance factor is ignored. (See the example from Demetrius above at footnote 48; see also the Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xx.28.

119. See Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xx.28 and above at footnote 48 for example.

120. Alliteration is not lacking in Bion, and possibly falls into the category of sound used only for effect, since the content of an alliterative section is not necessarily reflected in the sense. One should note, for instance, the "k" sounds in the quotation

cited in the context to note 119. Other examples are found in Teles, pp. 5.1 (. . .ποιητὴς περιθῇ πρόσωπον. . . ," and p. 9.8 ff. (an example of the repetition of "d," "p," and "t" sounds which, in this case, may be effective in demonstrating the anger of Penia).

121. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 48. Hense gives this example and calls the figure the "figuram conversionis," in his Prolegomena, p. ci.

122. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 50. cf. Hense, "Prolegomena," p. ci, who also gives this example.

123. Hense, "Prolegomena," pp. Lxi ff. cf. D. R. Dudley, op. cit., p. 47, theme number 156, which Oltramare interprets as "Les succès d'un maître qui attire une foule d'auditeurs ne doivent pas être recherchés." This remark perhaps could help one interpret Bion's intentions, although one always could say that the speaker is adopting a humble pose (possibly "captatio benevolentiae").

124. Concerning the Bionean diatribe, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Die griechische Literatur, p. 100, notes, "Es ist immer ethische Ermahnung und ganz praktische Moral, immer auch eine Kritik der Gesellschaft und ihrer Vorurteile, Umwertung der geltenden Werte." See also C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., pp. 109-110, who quotes this definition and comments (p. 109) that it gives ". . .the function, or rather functions, of the Bionean diatribe in a nutshell."

125. Teles, pp. 7-8. Cf. A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 50, who lists these themes.

126. Cf. Oltramare, op. cit., pp. 47 and 52, Teles; p. 41.15 ff., and Diogenes Laertius, IV, 50.

127. Teles, p. 9.8 ff.; cf. A. Oltramare; op. cit., p. 53 and Teles, p. 16.4 on the good actor.

128. Teles, p. 50.15 ff.; cf. A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 48 for this theme in Bion.

129. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 51; cited also by A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 48.

130. A. Oltramare, op. cit., pp. 52-53, cites this example. See also Hense, Prolegomena, p. cxvi.

XUM

Hense, assigns only line 13 to Bion, but the other lines may be assumed to reflect his opinion. It is interesting to note that Hegesias the Cyrenaic (3rd. century B. C.) is mentioned by Cicero (Tusc., I, xxxiv.83; cf. Susemihl, op. cit., p. 14) as composing a work called Apokarteron in which, among other topics, the idea "a malis egitur mors abducit, non a bonis, verum si quaerimus" was discussed "sic copiose" that Hegesias "a rege Plotemaeo prohibitus esse dicatur illa in scholis dicire, quod multi iis auditis mortem sibi ipsi consciscerent." Discussions of death were common in all schools and, of course, in popular wisdom as well; so one really cannot tie all of Bion's comments on death to any one school or person.

131. Teles, p. 31.1; cf. A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 64, who also cites this example.

132. Diogenes Laertius, IV, 49.

133. Teles, p. 59.6 ff.; cf. A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 62, who also cites this passage.

134. On the "common-sense spirit," see D. R. Dudley. Many of the themes, such as the emphasis on the simple life, are found in Cynicism, but one should realize that they are not confined to it. Most of the themes cited would fit easily into a discussion conducted by an Epicurean, a Stoic, or just a wise man.

F. Susemihl, op. cit., pp. 33 ff., notes Bion's contacts with different schools but feels that (p. 35) he remained a Cynic ". . .aber von laxerer Observang wie in der Lehre so erst recht im Leben."

135. D. R. Dudley, op. cit., pp. 84-87. See also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos, 292-319.

136. D. R. Dudley, op. cit., pp. 85 and 87; cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Mollendorff, Antigonos, pp. 300-304 and F. Susemihl, op. cit., pp. 41-42. See also footnote 58.

137. Hense, op. cit., pp. xiv-xv; see also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos, p. 292.

XUM

138. Cf. D. R. Dudley, op. cit., pp. 84-85. See also the context to note 59.

139. H. von Müller, De Teletis elocutione, pp. 70-73 discusses the figures in other passages of Teles.

140. C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., p. 32. See also ibid., p. 34.

141. See the context to footnotes 28, 29, and 30 and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos, p. 307.

One must remember, of course, that any discussion of the framework of the diatribes of Teles and Bion rests on fragments which could be in their original order or which could have been arranged by Theodorus or Stobaeus. The impression of a medley or mixture, however, should be a true one, since the elements mentioned seem to have occurred together within their respective diatribes.

Further, one must emphasize here that the term "diatribe" is not attested for these excerpts from Teles and must be applied with the same reservations with which it is applied to the work of Bion. See the context to footnote 26.

142. See A. Oltramare, op. cit., pp. 47 and 54, who includes this passage in his discussion of diatribe themes.

143. The asyndeton in this passage provides added emphasis.

A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 54, mentions an earlier part of this fragment (Teles, p. 35.4 ff.) and says that the theme is "Les avares ne savent pas profiter de ce qu'ils possèdent." That theme also could be assumed to underlie this passage.

144. A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 48, lists this theme as "La pauvreté n'est pas un mal," an interpretation which perhaps is too general.

145. A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 62 identifies this passage as an example of the theme "Les desirs sont insatiables." Perhaps, especially in the case of the slave, one should list this section as an example of discontent with one's lot, a description which can include the slave and the ambitious or greedy man.

This passage reminds one of Bion's attack on the man who cannot be content with simple things (Teles, p. 5 ff.).

146. Teles, p. 62.3-4. A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 57, lists this passage.

147. The example of Socrates, which follows, is attributed by Hense to Bion, as are the following two pages which also deal with the proper attitude toward grief and death, and use the Spartans as examples. See also A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 52, who lists this example of Socrates.

A. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 45, also lists as a theme "La tranquillité de l'âme (adiaphorie) donne le bonheur," but he does not include any example from Teles.

148. Fritz Wehrli, ed., Die Schule des Aristoleles, Text und Kommentar, VI (2nd. ed.; Basel, 1968), p. 9, fr. 1 and p. 32, fr. 10. See also Plutarch, Moralia, 605B (ed. W. R. Paton et al., Teubner, III, 1929, rep. 1972); F. Susemihl, op. cit., p. 150; Wilhelm Knögel, Die Peripatatiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem (Leipzig, 1933), p. 82. Ariston wrote a work entitled Lycon (Plutarch, Moralia, 145) which may have been a dialogue with Lycon as chief speaker (Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 43, fr. 33 and p. 66; see also Hirzel, op. cit., I, p. 331, note 2, as cited by Wehrli, p. 66.

149. Strabo in Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 32, fr. 11; cf. Hense, op. cit. p. cxvii; A. Gercke, "Ariston," Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie 5 (1892) 199 and passim; F. Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 31; W. Knögel, op. cit., p. 79.

150. Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 32, fr. 9.

151. See also Gercke, op. cit., p. 215.

152. Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 50; see also H. von Arnim Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta (hereafter to be cited in the text and footnotes as SVF, I, pp. 75-76, notes to fr. 333.

153. Sextus Empiricus, adv. math. VII, 12 quoted from von Arnim, SVF, I, fr. 356, p. 80; Seneca, found Ibid.; pp. 80 ff., fr. 358 and 359. Gercke, op. cit., pp. 199-200 discusses these fragments as evidence for ascribing a protreptic work to Ariston the Stoic.

154. Diogenes Laertius, VII, 160; cf. J. M. Rist, op. cit., p. 75, note 5. Rist notes that "Ariston's doctrine should be compared with the orthodox view that under special circumstances (ἄνευ περιστάσεως) some acts which are normally καθήκοντα are to be rejected, and again in special cases (κατὰ περίστασιν) that what is normally παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον should be done (D. L. 7.109 = SVF III 496). Ariston has made all καθήκοντα dependent on individual circumstances and abolished the possibility of the formulation of rules of conduct for normal circumstances." See also Rist, pp. 74-78 on Ariston's views; cf. Max Polenz, Die Stoa, I, pp. 121-123 and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Die griech. Literatur, p. 101, who comments that Ariston of Chios was ". . .mehr Kyniker als Stoiker. . . ."

155. Cf. SVF, II, fr. 10. Rist, op. cit., pp. 78 discussed Chrysippus and Ariston and cites this fragment.

156. See Rist, op. cit., p. 78.

157. F. Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 50; see also SVF, I, notes to fr. 333, and A. Gercke, op. cit., p. 216.

158. This argument is directed against Gercke, op. cit., pp. 203-205, who questions the attribution of the Stobaeus fragments to the Stoic. Knögel (p. 92) comments that ". . .die Stobaeus-ὁμοιώματα zum grössten Teil aus der Gedankenevelt des Stoikers stammen,. . ." and that ". . .man aber bei dreien an

den Keer als Verfasser denken kann." See also A. Giesecke, "Der Stoiker bei Ariston von Chios," Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie (ed. A. Fleckeisen, Leipzig, 1892), pp. 208 ff.

159. On the title see August Mayer, "Aristonstudien," Philologus, Supplementband XI (1908-1910) p. 594. The quotations from Athenaeus and Plutarch (Aristides, II) are found in the collection of fragments in Wehrli, op. cit., VI, pp. 41-42. All other references to the fragments of the Erotika Homoia will refer to this collection and will be cited by page and fragment numbers only.

160. Mayer, op. cit., p. 595 comments on this passage. Mayer also notes that the explanation of paidika could have Aristotle as a source.

161. Cf. Mayer, op. cit., p. 595, and Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 63 and III, p. 54 on Klearchos. See also Knögel, op. cit., pp. 83-84. One, however, should note that Stoics also wrote treatises on love (cf. Mayer, op. cit., pp. 594-595, note 258).

162. Knögel, op. cit., pp. 83 and 84. Ariston's reference to Themistocles and Aristides may have been part of a parallel example, perhaps concerning not only love, but also the dangers of rivalry. On classification literature, see also Mayer, op. cit., p. 594 and Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 63.

163. Friedrich Ritschl, Kleine Philologische Schriften, I (Leipzig, 1866) p. 558 ff. Mentioned by F. Susemihl, op. cit., p. 66, note 247. See also Mayer, op. cit., p. 594.

164. On the differences between homoia and homoiomata, see Knögel, op. cit., p. 83. See also Mayer, op. cit., p. 594.

165. See the context to footnote 72. Mayer, op. cit., p. 594, note 258 mentions Diogenes Laertius (VII, 34) ascription of an Erotikes technes to Zeno and (VII, 178) of erotic dialogues to Sphaerus.

166. Von Arnim, SVF, p. 75, in his notes to fr. 333 comments that the diatribes, among other writings listed on Diogenes ". . .valde accommodatus est ei philosopho. . . .". See also Mayer, op. cit., p. 594, and for the opposing view, Gercke, op. cit., p. 216.

167. Giesecke, op. cit., p. 206 argues that the Ariston who imitated Bion is not necessarily the Peripatetic, since, to Strabo's comments (X, 5.6) concerning Ariston the Peripatetic, a later commentator could have added

XUM

See also Richard Heinze "Ariston von Chios bei Plutarch und Horaz," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 45 (1890), pp. 513 ff. Knögel, op. cit., pp. 50-60, however, has found elements of the diatribal style in the work of Ariston of Ceos. There is no reason to assume, of course, that both Aristons could not have been influenced by Bion.

168. Controversy exists concerning the nature of the Gryllos which Quintilian (II, 17.14) describes as a work against rhetoric. For a discussion of Quintilian's statement see H. M. Hubbell, The Rhetorica of Philodemus, Translation and Commentary (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 23, 1920), p. 366, who comments that the Gryllus may be an early work written while Aristotle was ". . .still under the influence of Plato." Diogenes' version of the title, of course, makes the Gryllos seem to be a work favorable to rhetoric. See also George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, pp. 18 and 83, and W. Kroll, "Rhetorik," RE Supp. VII, 1940, col. 1058.

169. George Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 273-284, discusses Theophrastus and his stylistic theories. See also J. W. H. Atkins, Literary Criticism in Antiquity (London, rep. 1952), I, pp. 155-160.

170. See also George Kennedy, op. cit., p. 272. The Ciceronian citation, found in Wehrli, is from De finibus, V, 5.13.

171. Plutarch, Moralia, 804 E (ed. C. Hubert et al., Teubner, V.1, 1960). This edition will be the source for all quotations from, and references to, the Praecepta gerendae reipublicae.

172. See also Charles W. Fornara, "Sources of Plutarch's 'An seni sit gerenda res publica,'" Philologus 110 (1966), 123, note 1, who cites this fragment in SVF and who also comments that Wehrli ". . .attributes it to the Peripatetic for more dubious reasons. . . ." As Fornara also notes (p. 123), this same fragment, which occurs in very similar form (in Plutarch's "An seni sit gerenda res publica (787c), also has been used improperly in attempts to prove that both of these treatises by Plutarch have Ariston of Chios as a source.

173. Knögel, op. cit., p. 86 accepts this emendation while Wehrli, op. cit., apparently does not, since he does not include the quotation from Plutarch in his collection of the fragments of Ariston of Ceos (vol. VI). Von Arnim (SVF, I, 381), from whom the present writer has quoted the Ariston fragment, assumes that the Ariston mentioned is the Stoic.

XUM

Knögel includes the citations from *Demosthenes* (803E and 860A), *Aristides* (319D) and *Themistocles* (113A) in his collection of fragments, pp. 84-87.

174. George Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 291 cites and translates this section and discusses Stoic rhetoric on pp. 290-299. See also M. Polenz, *Die Stoa*, I, pp. 52 ff. on Stoic rhetoric and W. Kroll, "Rhetorik," RE Supp. VII, 1940, 1081 ff.

175. Polenz, *op. cit.*, I, p. 52 and II, p. 31. See also Diogenes Laertius VII, 42 (SVF, II, 48; Polenz, II, p. 31) and 44 and Sextus Empiricus, *adv. math.*, II, 6 (SVF, II, 294; Polenz, II, p. 31).

176. George Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 292; cf. Polenz, *op. cit.*, I; p. 52. Kennedy cites Quintilian, V, *Prooemium*, who mentions ". . .quidem auctores, quibus solum videretur oratoris officium docere; namque et adfectus duplici ratione excludendos putabant, primum quia vitium esset omnis animi perturbatio, deinde quia iudicem a veritate depelli misericordia gratia similibusque non oporteret, et voluptatem audientium petere, cum vincendi tantum gratia diceretur, non modo agenti supervacuum, sed vix etiam viro dignum arbitrabantur. . . ;" (quoted from edition). Kennedy notes that this is Stoic doctrine.

177. George Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

178. R. Heinze, "Ariston von Chios bei Plutarch und Horaz," p. 513 also cites this passage from Diogenes in his attempt to show a connection between Ariston of Chios and Bion.

Another important comment is found in Sextus Empiricus, *Pros logikous*, I, 12 (SVF, I, fr. 356), who also mentions Ariston's rejection of dialectic and, in addition, notes ". . .ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ἠθικοῦ τόπους τινὰς συμπεριέγραφεν, καθάπερ τόν τε παραινετικὸν καὶ τὸν ὑποθετικὸν τόπον· τοξτοξς γὰρ εἰς τίτθας καὶ παιδαγωγοὺς πίπτειν, . . . ," a comment which might reflect Ariston's attitude toward admonitory rhetoric.

179. J. W. H. Atkins, *op. cit.*, I, p. 176. According to Dirk M. Schenkeveld, "῾ΟΙ ΚΡΙΤΙΚΟΙ in Philodemus," *Mnemosyne*, Series IV, 21 (1968) 180, Ariston was concerned with both "διάνοια content" and "σύνθεσις, composition" and

"held that if a poem had good content but bad composition, the whole poem should be rejected."

The work on poetry by Ariston from which Philodemus derived his information, as presented in one of Philodemus' two works on poetry (on which see Schenkeveld op. cit., p. 176, note 3, and Fr. Sbordone, Sui papiri della poetica di Filodemo, Atti dell xi Congresso Internationale di Papirologia, Milan, 1966, pp. 312-324) obviously is not included on Diogenes' list. See also Christian Jensen, "Zur Poetik des. Stoikers Ariston von Chios," in his Philodemos über die Gedichte, Fünftes Buch (Berlin, 1923), pp. 128-145.

180. Schenkeveld, op. cit., p. 180; cf. Jensen's edition (op. cit.) of Philodemus, col. xiv, 6 ff. (p. 35).

181. References to the Sudhaus edition will be indicated in the text of this chapter only by volume, page, and fragment or column number.

182. Harry M. Hubbell, The Rhetorica of Philodemus, p. 332.

183. Cf. Wehrli, X, p. 79. Many passages in this section (pp. 329-359) are listed in SVF, III, 91-110, as references to the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon.

184. Wehrli (VI, p. 51) comments "die Seltenheit, mit der vom Beginn unserer Zeitrechnung an vor allem die ethischen Schriften des A. zitiert werden, verspricht wenig Erfolg für Versuche, ganze Traktate kaiserzeitlicher Autoren auf ihn zurückzuführen; über Mayers zu weit gehende Zuweisungen aus Plutarchs Praecepta gerendae rei publicae. . . ."

185. Cf. Wehrli, X, p. 80; Hubbel, op. cit., p. 337; Mayer, op. cit., p. 598, and Sudhaus, op. cit., p. Lll.

186. See also Hubbell's (op.cit.) interpretation, p. 339.

187. Hubbell, op. cit., p. 339 seems to have a slightly different interpretation of this passage, for he translates the words ei kai rhetor as ". . .fully as much so as the rhetor [who should try to sail a boat in a storm]."

188. Perhaps Plutarch's actual source is Ariston the Stoic. Fornara, op. cit., pp. 120 ff. has argued convincingly that the Stoic is the source for the treatise "An seni sit gerenda res publica" by Plutarch, a treatise which could possibly be considered a companion to the Praecepta gerendae reipublicae. If one hesitates

to assume that Plutarch, living in the late first century A. D., could have had access to the works of Ariston, who lived in the third century B. C., one might make the conjecture that Plutarch knew a collection of the sayings of Ariston or else used as his source a work which had used such a collection or the writings of Ariston himself. One should note further that in arguing in favor of eloquence, and connecting it with the speaker's character and his political success, Plutarch is close to the views expounded by Aristotle in his Ars Rhetorica (see especially Book II), a position which he would hardly be likely to take if he were arguing against a true Peripatetic.

189. See for example Aristotle's comments on the political life in the Ethica Nicomachea, I, 1194A ff., and the discussion of rhetoric and politics in Book I of the Ars Rhetorica (1359B ff.) and I, 1094A-1094B of the Ethica Nicomachea.

See also Fornara, op. cit., p. 120 and note 2 on the Peripatetic attitude toward political life.

This admonition, of course, also may be at odds with normal Stoic doctrine (cf. Fornara, p. 121).

On the Peripatetic section in Philodemus, see Mayer, op. cit., pp. 522-562. A discussion of all of these passages is beyond the scope of this chapter.

190. It is possible, of course, that these two columns represent arguments by an unorthodox Stoic, such as Ariston, especially if one could assume that Ariston would have rejected rhetoric as strongly as he did dialectic.

191. See also J. M. Rist, op. cit., p. 75, note 5 who cites this passage.

192. Hubbell, op. cit., p. 252.

193. Ibid., p. 332.

194. Hubbell's (op. cit.) introduction, pp. 252 ff., includes a good discussion of Philodemus' views and a helpful outline of the contents of his treatise, which has been useful for locating these passages on political and sophistic rhetoric.

195. See the context to footnote 187.

XUM

196. Cf. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, pp. 322-323; Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. mathematicos*, II, 12 and 20 (Wehrli, X, p. 55, fr. 32 and p. 56, fr. 34.); Philodemus, *Rhetorica*, Sudhaus, I, pp. 355-359 (Stoic views) and p. 14, fr. V and p. 16, fr. IX; Hubbell, *op. cit.*, p. 268, note 2.

197. Mayer (*op. cit.*, pp. 512-513) is unconvinced by attempts to identify Philodemus' Ariston with Ariston of Cos and comments "da nun der Keer Lehrer des Kritolaos war, lag nahe, zu argumentieren, dass es sich hier um einen andern Ariston handle, wozu sich der sonst gänzlich unbekannte Koer zu eignen schien: dieser hatte also-ein ziemlich künstlicher Ausweg!-sowohl das Schulhaupt Ariston (nach Strabo) als auch dessen Nachfolger Kritolaos (nach Quintilian und Sextus) gehört."

Susemihl (*op. cit.*, I, p. 152, note 795) on the other hand mentions the references to Ariston in Philodemus, Quintilian (II, xv. 19-20; Wehrli, X, p. 79, fr. 1), Sextus Empiricus (*adv. Math.*, II, 61, Wehrli, X, p. 79, fr. 2, where there occurs the phrase ". . .
(. . .Ἀρίστων ὁ Κριτολάου γνώριμος . . ."),
and Strabo (XIV, 658, where an Ariston of Kos, the Peripatetic, is mentioned), and then comments, "Dazu kommt, dass A. bei Philod. ebendas. III, 4. Fr. 4 hinter Kritolaos genannt wird:

Κριτολάῳ καὶ Ἀρί<στωνι>

(vgl. ebend. 5. Fr. 6, wo Kritolaos allein erscheint, und Col. 15, aus welcher letztern Stelle in Verbindung mit jenen obigen mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit zu schliessen ist, dass dieser jüngere A. ". . .in jenen Commentaren
[Ὑπομνήματα]
die Lehren seines Meisters Kritolaos," welche dieser indessen doch auch schriftlich vorgetragen zu haben scheint [s. A. 804], ". . .aufgezeichnet haben mochte, ..."

198. Diogenes Laertius (V, 48-49) lists among the works of Theophrastus *Hypomnematon Aristotelikon e Theophrasteion*, [6 books], and *ta hyomnemata a*. Athenaeus (XIII, 607a; SVF, I, for 451) mentions *hypomnemata* by the Stoic Persaius, as does Diogenes Laertius (VII, 1; SVF, I, fr. 453). Cleanthes (Plutarch, *Moralia*, 1034D; SVF, I, fr. 563) is recorded as having written *hypomnemata physica*.

199. See Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 159, who comments that "the was so called because of its ulilitarian intent. Hence it is

especially associated with the more practical sects of Greek philosophy, notably with the Cynics and the Stoics. "Further" the

χρεία is not, however, the exclusive weapon of the Cynics and Stoics. On the contrary we find philosophers from all the schools represented by such instructive anecdotes." See also Gercke, op. cit., p. 216, who mentions Stoic Chreias (of Cleanthes, Perseus, and Sphaerus).

Chreiai also, of course, formed an important exercise used in rhetorical training (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, XLII.54; Quintilian, I, IX.3 and II, iv.26; H. I. Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity (3rd. ed., 1964) pp. 218 and 238 ff.; Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, p. 270; G. Reichel, Quaestiones Progymnasticae, p. 46).

200. Fiske, op. cit., p. 156.

201. Fiske, op. cit., p. 156, notes that "the tradition thus started by Xenophon was continued by the earlier Stoa which shared with the Cynics this interest in the study of personality."

202. See M. Ruch, op. cit., pp. 45 ff. The dialogue form also was used by Antisthenes (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 1) and perhaps Diogenes the Cynic (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 80), both of whom are connected with Cynicism and thus indirectly with Stoicism. Stoics other than Persaeus and Sphaerus could have written dialogues, but no mention of such works is recorded in SVF.

203. On Heracleides see Hirtzel, op. cit., I, pp. 321 ff. and Diogenes Laertius, V, 86.

204. Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 66; cf. Hirzel, op. cit., I, p. 331, note 2. Hirzel (Ibid.) notes that this could be a memorial dialogue and says that "die Tradition, wie sie durch Platon im Phaidon begonnen, durch Aristoteles im Endem fortgesetzt worden war, wies hier einen anderen Weg: ihr zu Folge lag der beste Trost in dem Hinweis auf ein besseres Dasein, welches den geschiedenen Freund nach diesem Leben erwartete." On the Eudemus, see Werner Jaeger, Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of his Development, tr. Richard Robinson (Oxford, paperback ed., 1962, rep. 1967), pp. 29-30.

205. Cf. Wehrli, op. cit., VI, p. 66; Hirtzel, op. cit., p. 331, note 2; Friedrich Ritschl, "Aristo der Peripatetiker bei Cicero De Senectute," Kleine Philologische Schriften (Leipzig, 1800) I, pp. 552-553.

206. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 120. See also C. Fornara, *op. cit.*, p. 121, who comments that "the better MSS have *Chius* (cf. Wuillenmier, in his edition, Paris 1940, 56). Parisinus 6332 (which Simbeck rated highly) reads *Aristo* alone, which may explain (as correction) the *Aristoteles* of Leidensis Vossianus O 79, thus allowing the suspicion that the ethnika of the other MSS are glosses. If that were so, probabilities would in this case also favor a reference to the Chian as the better known. But this is speculation. "See also W. Knögel, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-81 and Luigi Alfonsi, "Su Aristone di Ceo," *Aevum* 31 (1957), 366, who notes the difficulties caused "a parte l'identita di pronuncia dall epoca ellentistica tra Χῖος e Κεῖος . . . . ."

Cf. Hellfried Dahlmann, "Bemerkungen zu Varros Menippea Tithonus, περὶ γήρως" (in *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik*, ed. H. Dahlmann and Reinhold Merkelbach, Köln, 1959), p. 37.

207. See Fornara, *op. cit.*, pp. 122-125. On p. 122, note 1, Fornara gives some modern literature concerning Plutarch and Cicero, of which special attention should be paid to Wehrli, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 51-52 and K. Ziegler, RE XXl.1, 821-56-822-48. The evidence for assuming that there was a common source and that this source was the *Tithonus* by an Ariston cannot be considered in detail here. See also W. Knögel, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82.

208. Fornara, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

209. *Ibid.*, p. 123.

210. Fornara, *op. cit.*, p. 120, notes that Plutarch's opponent seems to be ". . .no Peripatetic, as we may infer from the use by Plutarch of Peripatetic arguments to confute him and from the unlikelihood, as well, that any follower of Aristotle will have thrown such an obstacle as age into the path of the πολιτικὸς ἀνήρ ." In addition, the opponent does not seem to be an Epicurean "for he does not dispute the value of the political life."

211. See Fornara's arguments, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-121. Fornara cites Sextus Empiricus, *adv. math.*, 11.66 (SVF, I, 361), and states that, "as we learn from Sextus, he assigned a varying and elastic value to what he judged to be inherently indifferent. Thus the wise man will prefer ill-health should a tyrant recruit the hale to serve and, ultimately, to suffer with him."

XUM

See also J. M. Rist, op. cit., pp. 75 ff.

212. See the context to footnotes 44, 45, 128 and 129.

213. Cf. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 39 and, on Ariston's

J. M. Rist, op. cit., pp. 74 ff.; on Cynic views, see Rist, pp. 62 ff.

214. Fornara, op. cit., p. 124 (Fornara also gives here the reference to the works of Persaeus and Herillus). M. Ruch, op. cit., p. 54, refers to the Tithonus as a dialogue and attributes it to Ariston of Ceos.

The last of the works of Antisthenes, given by Diogenes Laertius (VI, 15-18), contains the names of many mythological figures as titles, but these seem to be primarily treatises, not dialogues. See also the list of dialogues attributed to Diogenes of Sinope (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 80).

On the genre of the Tithonus, see Hirtzel, op. cit., I, p. 342, who writes about "Monologe im Dialog," and attributes (p. 331 ff.) the Tithonus to Ariston of Ceos.

215. Fornara's other arguments, found on pp. 123-127 need not be discussed here, even though he successfully refutes Wehrli's (op. cit. VII, pp. 51-52) contention that Ariston of Ceos must be the author of the Tithonus.

216. See literature and references quoted by H. Throm, op. cit., p. 164. See also footnote 26 above for arguments for and against the use of the term scholē to indicate a diatribe. As was the case with the term diatribē, the term scholē varies in meaning and may be used to indicate leisure time, a school, or a discussion, all of which translations, of course, also can be used for the term diatribē. In Bion and Teles the term is used once (Teles, p. 18.1) in a chreia, and seems to have the meaning leisure or idleness. The verb scholazein in its meaning of "study" is found in Bion (Teles, p. 40.5), when Metrocles is mentioned as studying with Theophrastus and Xenocrates (cf. Diogenes Laertius, VI, 94 on Metrocles the Cynic as a pupil of Theophrastus), and in the meaning "to be at leisure" in Teles, p. 45.4 and 46.5. There is no evidence in the fragments of Teles (or in those of Bion and others as preserved by Teles) that the term scholē was used to indicate works such as those of Bion or Teles.

On the use of *scholē* to mean "discussion" see Plato, *Laws*, 802c and Aristotle, *Polileia*, 1323B39.

217. Hirtzel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 526, note 1, mentions Book I, 7 ff. and 113 and Book III, 81. See also p. 369-370, note 2, for a discussion of diatribe and schola. See also Throm, *op. cit.*, p. 188; Wendland, op. cit. p. 6; Philippson (*Gnomon*, 1927), p. 728.

218. On the relationship of this passage of Cicero to consolation literature, see Robert Philippson, "Review of Jacob van Wageningen, *de Ciceronis libro consolationis*," *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 37 (1917) 503-504. Cf. S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* (Liverpool, 1969), pp. 30-31.

219. See also Throm, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-189.

220. Cf. Hirtzel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 326, who thinks that the *scholē* and the diatribe are not the same thing, and, for an opposing view, Sinko, "Über die kynisch-stoische Diatribe," *Eos*, XXI, 1916 (in Polish) as cited by Throm, *op. cit.*, p. 155, note 4, and p. 164.

Plutarch, although, of course, later than Cicero, apparently recognized a difference of some kind between *scholē* and *diatribē*, for in *de exilio* (*Moralia*, 605A; Teubner, III, 1972) he comments,

"Εἰ δὲ φήσει τις ὅτι δόξαν οὗτοι καὶ Τιμὰς ἐθήρευον, ἐπὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐλθὲ καὶ τὰς σοφὰς Ἀθήνησι σχολὰς καὶ διατριβάς · ἀναπέμπασαι τὰς ἐν Λυκείῳ, τὰς ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ, τὴν Στοάν, τὸ Παλλάδιον, τὸ Ὡιδεῖον."
Hirtzel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 371, note 2, also mentions this passage. Further, the fact that Diogenes Laertius lists *scholas* and *diatribas* separately in his list of Ariston's work (SVF, I, fr. 333; Wehrli, VI, p. 32, fr. 9) seems to indicate that his source also saw a difference between the two types of writing.

221. G. Reichel, *Quaestiones Progymnasticae*, p. 106; cf. Throm, *op. cit.*, p. 189 who agrees with Reichel that the *Tusculans* are *theses*.

222. Cicero, *De inventione*, I, vi.8 (ed. E. Stroebel, 1915; rep. 1965, Teubner; this edition will be the source for all references to and quotations from the *de Inventione*) also cited by S. F. Bonner,

(pp. 2-4) and are divided by him into topics concerning "the universe and its problems," the "law and government," "man and his social duties," "questions of abstract thought," and "questions of everyday life."

223. Bonner, op. cit., p. 2, quotes the first part of this definition.

224. See Bonner, op. cit., p. 2 and also Aristotle, Topica, I, xi (104B29) on problema.

225. Bonner, op. cit., p. 5, refers to this passage and to Throm, op. cit., pp. 171-179 (who has a rather full discussion of the Peripatos), when he comments that "both Aristotle and Theophrastus, in fact, wrote several books of 'theses,' and made particular use of them for combined philosophical and rhetorical training; in debates both pro and contra."

226. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, 1963), p. 21. Kennedy also notes that ". . .the philosophers saw in the advanced study of rhetoric a practical threat to their domination of higher education and the substitution of a system which was of great superficiality." Further, according to Kennedy, "the dispute between rhetoric and philosophy in the time of Aristotle had ended in a compromise in which philosophers accepted rhetoric as a means to a goal. The dispute between rhetoric and philosophy in the second century was never satisfactorily resolved, but rather faded away." See also Kennedy, pp. 322 ff.

On the attitude of Critolaus toward rhetoric see Quintilian, II, 17.14 (Wehrli, X, p. 53, fr. 25) and 15.23 (Wehrli, X, p. 54, fr. 26). See also Philodemus, Rhetorica II, 102 fr. vii (Wehrli, X, p. 54, fr. 29). Critolaus' style, however, is described as "scita et tereti. . ." (Macrobius, Saturnalia, I, 5.13, Wehrli, X, p. 50, fr. 8).

On Diogenes of Babylon, see SVF, III, fr. 91, 100, and 101. Aulus Gellius, Noct. Att. VI, 14.8 (SVF, III, fr. 8) describes Diogenes' style as "modesta. . .et sobria. . . ."

On Carneades and his pupil Charmadas see Cicero, de Oratore, I, 89 ff. and Sextus Empiricus, Adv. Math., II, 20 ff. (both cited and discussed by Kennedy, pp. 322 and 324 ff.). Carneades' style is called "violenta et rapida" by Macrobius, Saturnalia I, 5.13 (Wehrli, X, p. 55, fr. 8). Quintilian, XII, 1.35, comments, "neque enim Academici, cum in utramque disserunt partem, non secundum alteram vivunt, nec Carneades ille, qui Romae audiente Censorio Catone non minoribus viribus contra iustitiam dicitur disseruisse quam pridie pro iustitia dixerat, iniustus ipse vir fuit."

227. See Bonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6 and the reference cited by him (*de Oratore* III, 27, 107-8, 30, 120; and Quintilian, III, 5.15). See also Cicero, *Orator*, 1.3 ff.; 3.11 ff., and *De partitione oratoria*, 30.139 on the studies necessary for an orator.

228. See Bonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-31.

229. On *thesis* as a speech see Bonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3 and Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, p. 20. See also Throm, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

230. See the discussions in this chapter of the themes found in Bion and Teles. The *thesis* itself, as has been seen in the discussion in this chapter, existed prior to Hermagoras (c.150 B. C.; see Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 3) to whom is credited the division between *thesis* and *hypothesis* (a theme dealing with a specific individual-see Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 5.). On Hermagoras and the *thesis* see Cicero, *de Inventione*, I, vi.8 and *Brutus*, 263 (cf. Hermagoras, ed. D. Matthes).

231. See Oltramare, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-124. These elements will be discussed later in this chapter. It should be mentioned here, however, that an author such as Cicero, a well-read man trained in rhetoric, easily could have mingled many styles and influences within the same work, a process which makes the description of the *schola* presented in this chapter all the more tentative.

232. The fragments of the lives of philosophers, the paradoxes, and the possibly political writings of Ariston of Ceos, all collected by Wehrli, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 42-44, will not be discussed since they are not germane to the study of the diatribe and are of no real help in solving the difficulties concerning the works listed by Diogenes Laertius. On Ariston's biographies of philosophers, see also Knögel, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-78.

233. All of the references to the fragments of Ariston found in Philodemus' *Peri Kakion* will be taken from Wehrli, *op. cit.*, unless otherwise indicated.

234. Christian Jensen (*Bonner Jahrbuch*, 135, 1930, p. 57, produced the emendation ἐπιτομή which replaces ἐπιστολή and is accepted by Knögel, *op. cit.*, p. 8 and by Wehrli, *op. cit.* VI, p. 55.

XUM

Wehrli rejects Knögel's (p. 8) σοφῶν in favor of μόνων (see VI, p. 33), although Knögel's reading seems to deserve serious consideration in view of the list of philosophers which follows in the same column.

235. Knögel, *op. cit.*, p. 10, cites the letter of Epicurus written to Heraclitus, which the author himself designates (I, 35) as an epitome of the Epicurean system.

236. Knögel, *op. cit.*, p. 13, says, "Aus diesem Satze Philodems (X, 12 ff.) geht hervor, dass Ariston für seine *Epitome* die Form der Selbstbetrachtung gewählt hatte."

237. I have followed Knögel's division and summary here. See also Wehrli, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 53-55, and pp. 33 ff., who designates the two sections as fragments 13 and 14.

238. See Wehrli's convincing arguments on pp. 53-55 of volume VI. Knögel's (p. 16) divisions would seem to support Wehrli's arguments, although Knögel does not postulate two separate works.

239. On the possible rhetorical purpose of Theophrastus' *Characteres*, see D. J. Furley, "The Purpose of Theophrastus' Characters," *Symb. Osl.*, 30 (1950), 56 (cited also by Albin Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, p. 687, note 2). See also Wehrli's commentary on Ariston (VI, pp. 55 ff); C. G. Corbet, "Ad Philodemum Librum X "περὶ κακιῶν et Theophrasti Χαραχτῆρας ἠθικούς ," *Mnemosyne*, 2 N. S. (1874), pp. 32-33; J. L. Ussing, Theophrasti *Characteres et Philodemi de vitiis liber decimus* (Leipzig, 1868), p. 160; O. Regenbogen, "Theophrastus," RE Supp. VII, 1940, 1507-1510.

240. Knögel, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-47 and 73-78. Of special importance is the section "Aristons Epitome und die Stoa," pp. 40-47, which draws the conclusion that "in Aristons Epitome findet sich demnach nichts, was den Einfluss stoischer Lehre oder gar die Autorschaft des Ariston von Chios beweisen kann." See also J. L. Ussing, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-160 and Christian Jensen, "Ariston von Keos bei Philodem," *Hermes*, 46 (1911) pp. 393-406, especially pp. 405-406. Wehrli (VI, p. 53) also attributing the works to Ariston of Ceos, observes that "hinzu kommt die gut peripatetische, für einen Stoiker unmögliche Anerkennung von Tyche als Lebensmacht (Stellen bei Knögel 19), vor allem der Gedanke, dass das äussere Glück für den Charakter des Menschen verantwortlich werden könne. . ., fr. 13 I." In addition, Wehrli convincingly dismisses the possibility that the less well known Ariston of Cos (see above at footnote 197) is the author of these two works.

241. See above at footnote 149; cf. Knögel, *op. cit.*, p. 75. All references to Knögel's comments will be included in the text of this chapter; the test of the Ariston fragments will be taken from Wehrli, *op. cit.*, and also indicated in the text.

242. See Knögel, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57 who separates the anecdotes into apophthegmata and "Anekdoten ohne wörtliche Rede."

243. See above at footnote 108 ff.

244. Knögel does not equate the reader with the imaginary interlocutor, for on p. 59, he notes the lack in the fragments of "Fiktion eines redenden Gegners,. . . ."

245. One must be cautious, of course, in depending on fragments such as these and cannot rule out entirely the possibility that these infinitives do indicate that Philodemus' quotations of Ariston were phrased in indirect speech. The present writer has indicated the possibility that these infinitives could be infinitives primarily to show that Knögel's (p. 13) proof to the contrary is not convincing.

246. On the humor to be found in ridiculing faults, see Mary A. Grant., *The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 21, Madison, 1924), especially pp. 34-37 (on Demetrius of Phalereum and Plutarch) and pp. 78-87 (on Cicero).

247. Other examples of these three forms of repetition are found in Knögel, *op. cit.*, on pp. 51-53. See above at notes 117, 118, 119, ff. on repetition in Bion.

See above at footnote 48 for Quintilian and Demetrius. The present writer disagrees with many of Knögel's examples since the parallelism in phrases required according to the ancient definitions often is lacking in them.

To Knögel's list entitled "Gleichklang von Wortänfangen" (p. 53) should be added Wehrli, VI, pp. 38, fr. 14 V:
"ὁ μὲν οὖν ὑπερήφανος καὶ ὑπερόπτης ἐστίν, ὁ δ᾽ὑπερό[π]της οὐ πάν[τ]ως καὶ ὑπε[ρ]ηφανεῖ";
fr. 14 IV:
" καὶ τῆς ὑπε[ρ]ηφανίας καὶ ὑπεροψίας. . .";

and fr. 14 VI: "καὶ βρενθυέσθαι δὲ καὶ βρενθυόμενον ὠνόμαζον καὶ ἔτι νῦν ὀνομάζουσιν. . ."

XUM

248. Knögel, op. cit., pp. 53-59, lists other examples of polysyndeton found in columns XV-XXIV (Wehrli, fr. 13 VI-14 IX). Additional examples not listed by Knögel may include Wehrli, VI, p. 36, fr. 14 II: ". . .[καὶ]μηθὲν ἄλλο, καὶ τὸν συναλείψαντα μὴ ἀντισυναλείφεν·καὶ ξενισθεὶς μ[ὴ] ἀντιξενίσαι· καὶ θύραν ἀλλοτρίαν. . ."; p. 37, fr. 14 III: ". . .ἀλλὰ καὶ κατασκ[ευάζε]ιν οἰκίαν καὶ πλοῖον δι᾽αὑτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς ἀρχιτέκτονος·καὶ γράφειν. . .καὶ δούλους.. .· καὶ φυτεύειν καὶ φορτίζεσθαι. . .· καὶ ναυαγῶν. . ."; p. 37, fr. 14 IV: ". . .καὶ τῆς ἀλαζονείας.., καὶ ἰδίως τὰ...καὶ τὰ..., καὶ τὸ..., καὶ τὸ...."; p. 38, fr. 14 VI: "...καὶ βρενθύεσθαι δὲ καὶ βρενθυόμενον ὠνόμαζον καὶ ἔτι νῦν ὀνομάζουσιν...."; and p. 40, fr. IX: "...καὶ περιττότερόν...καὶ βασκαντικῇ καὶ φθονητ[ι]κῇ·καὶ τὸν...".
On polysyndeton in Bion see footnote 113 above.

249. On asyndeton in Bion see above at footnote 112 ff.

250. To Knögel's list (p. 55) may be added Wehrli, VI, p. 35, fr. 13 VI: "...τοῦ μὲν μεγαλοψ[ύ]χου τὸ καταφρονεῖν τῶν τυχη[ρ]ῶν ὑπερέχοντα τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄγκῳ, τοῦ δ᾽ὑπερηφάνου τὸ διὰ κουφότητα ταύτης ἐκπνευματούμενον ὑπὸ κτήσεως ὑπερορᾶν ἑτέρους...", and p. 40, fr. 14 IX: "λ[οι]πὸν ἔστιν μὲν ὅτε τοιοῦτοί τινές εἰσιν ὑπεροχὴν ἐμφαίνοντες ἰδίαν ἢ τῶν οὓς ἀποσεμνύνουσιν, ἔστιν δ᾽ὅτε κατατρέχοντες μόνον ἐνίων, ὥστε τοὺς προτέρους καὶ ὑπερηφάνους εἶναι·...."

On the use of isocolon by Bion see above at note 112 ff.

Knögel also lists other figures such as chiasmus, synonyma, and epidiorthoses (pp. 51-55) and gives a useful list of words

XUM

from medicine, daily life, and proverbs, found in Ariston, and indicative of the diatribal style (and its diction).

251. See also Bion in Teles, p. 10.6 and above at footnote 128. Knögel does not discuss these themes as diatribal elements.

252. See also Ariston in Wehrli, VI, p. 33, col. XI on *tyche*, and the tyrant, and Wehrli, VI, p. 53 on *tyche* and the Peripatos; Johannes Stroux, "Die stoische Beurteilung Alexanders des Grossen," *Philologus* 88 (1933), p. 229 (cited by Wehrli, VI, p. 53); Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 46, on themes concerning *tyche*.

253. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 61. The themes are credited to Antisthenes by Oltramare, but can be considered part of the common store of diatribal themes.

254. All quotations from Theophrastus will be taken from the edition by W. Diels (Oxford, 1909, rep. 1952). The notes in the old edition by R. C. Jebb (*The Characters of Theophrastus*; second ed. 1909, ed. J. E. Sandys, London) are still very helpful. J. L. Ussing (ed., *Theophrasti Characteres et Philodemi de vities liber decimus*, Leipzig, 1868) recognized at least the generic connection between the work of Theophrastus and the character sketches found in the *Peri kakion* X (see his *Praefatio*, p. V and his commentary, pp. 167, and 175-176). Neither Ussing nor Wehrli in his commentary undertakes a comparative stylistic analysis.

For other examples, see *opsimathia*, XXVII, 3.5-6, *dyschereia*, XIX, 2.3-4; *periergia*, XIII, 10.15 ff.; and *hyperephania*, XXIV, 13.18-21.

255. For other examples of isocolon, see *authadeia*, XV, 7.10 ff.; *hyperephania*, XXIV, 13.19 ("ὅτι. . .ὅτι); *eironeia*, I, 5.14 ff.; and *areskeia*, V, 6.7-18.

256. J. D. Denniston, *op. cit.*, p. 129, writes concerning alliteration that it ". . .was one of the means regularly employed by the pre-Socratics to lend distinction to their prose. It was subsequently almost entirely dropped, as too crude and primitive a device, and its place taken by more intellectual forms of assonance. Its occasional appearance in Plato I should regard as part of his legacy from the Ionean philosophers." The frequent repetition of initial consonantal and vowel sounds in series found in a work such as Theophastus' *Characteres*, however, even though often perhaps accidental, casts doubt on Denniston's conclusions in the case of writers heavily influenced by rhetoric and the Gorgianic

figures. On repetition in early Greek literature, see Detlev Fehling, *Die Wiederholungefiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin, 1969.

Other examples include the repetition of "d" in "καὶ διανέμων μερίδας φῆσαι δίκαιον εἶναι διμοιρίαν τῷ διανέμοντι δίδοσθαι. . ." (*aischrokerdeia*, XXX, 4.5-6), the repetition of "p" and "k" sounds in "καὶ στρατευόμενος δὲ<τοῦ>πεζοῦ ἐκβοηθοῦντας τοὺς <δημότας> προσκαλεῖν, κελεύων πρὸς αὑτὸν στάντας πρῶτον περιιδεῖν, καὶ λέγειν, ὡς ἔργον διαγνῶναί ἐστι, πότεροί εἰσιν οἱ πολέμιοι· καὶ ἀκούων κραυγῆς καὶ ὁρῶν πίπτοντας εἰπεῖν πρὸς τοὺς παρεστηκότας, . . ." (*deilia*, XXV, 3.10-4.14), and the repetition of "d" in

". . .δεισιδαιμονία δόξειεν<ἂν>εἶναι δειλία πρὸς τὸ δαιμόνιον, ὁ δὲ δεισιδαίμων. . ."
(from *desidaimonia*, XVI, 1.1 ff.).

257. Homoeoteleuton sometimes appears together with antithesis as in ". . .ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν ἀρχήν τοῖς δὲ συλλαβήν, . . ." and ". . .τὰς μὲν φεύγειν, τὰς δὲ διώκειν, τὰς δὲ ἐξόμνυσθαι, ταῖς δὲ παρεῖναι. . ." (*aponoia*, VI, 7.19 and 8.22-23).

258. As another instance, the beginning of the description of the *panteidemon* may be cited, which reads as follows (Wehrli, VI, p. 37, fr. 14 III, 9-11):

τούτου δ'ἔτι χείρων ἐστὶν ὁ παντειδήμων, ἀναπεπεικὼς ἑαυτὸ[ν] ὅτι π[ά]ντα γινώσκε[ι], τὰ μὲν μαθὼ[ν] παρὰ τῶν μάλιστ'ἐπ[ι]σταμένων, τὰ δ'ἰδὼν ποιοῦντας μόνον, τὰ δ'αὐτὸς ἐπινοήσας ἀφ'[α]ὑτοῦ. κἄστι τοιοῦτος οὐ μ[ό]νον οἷον
Ἱππίαν τὸν Ἠλεῖον [ἱ]στ[ο]ρεῖ Πλάτων. . . .

259. See Knögel, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-40 on "Aristons Charaktere in ihrem Verhältnis zur peripatetischen Ethik." Especially important are the comparisons Knögel (pp. 18-23, 25-26, 28, 35) draws between the definitions or descriptions of certain character types given by Aristotle in his *Nichomachean Ethics* and the content of Ariston's sketches. Further, concerning the trait *megalopsychia*, Knögel notes (p. 18), "Schliesslich ist noch zu erwähnen, dass in diesen Abschnitten über die die Formen der späteren Charakterologie so auffällig sind, dass man in ihnen das Vorbild für die im Peripatos beliebte ethische Charakteristik sehen könnte."

260. The full title of the work may have been "Φιλοδήμου περὶ κακιῶν καὶ τῶν ἀντικειμένων ἀρετῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν οἷς εἰσι καὶ περὶ ἅ θ." See the introduction (p. v-vi) to Christian Jensen's edition (Teubner, 1909) of Philodemus' *Peri kakion* and J. L. Ussing, *Theophrasti Characteres et Philodemi de vitiis liber decimus* (Leipzig, 1868), p. 154.

261. All of the quotations from the *Peri kakion* found in this paragraph are taken from the edition by C. Jensen, Teubner, 1909.

262. Phillip Howard De Lacy and Estelle Allen De Lacy, eds., *Philodemus: On Methods of Inference*, *A Study in Ancient Empiricism*, (ed. with translation and commentary) in *Philological Monographs* published by the American Philological Association, Philadelphia, 1941.

On p. 154 the De Lacys write, "among the empirical elements in Philodemus' ethical writings should also be mentioned the criticism of Platonic dialectic in the work *On Vices*." The section of the *Peri kakion* (Jensen, col. XXII, 20, ff.; Wehrli, VI, p. 39, fr. 14 VII) which they call ". . .the criticism of Platonic dialectic. . ." is a part of the description of the eiron and seems to be a criticism, not of dialectic itself, but of the actions of the "dissembler" who is described in the Theophrastian manner and does not seem to possess true Socratic irony (see R. C. Jebb, *The Characters of Theophrastus*, 2nd. ed. by J. E. Sandys, London, 1909; pp. 51-53, on Theophrastus' concept of the ironic man, a concept which differs, according to Jebb, from the Aristotelian.) Further, in including this section as an example of Philodemus' empiricism, the De Lacys seem to have overlooked the fact that this passage depends on Ariston, not on Philodemus himself.

Concerning the list of diatribes by Philodemus, see also Wolfgang Schmid, "Epikur," in Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum, V (1962), 750, who lists among Philodemus' works ". . .die popularphilosophischen Traktate zur Sittenschilderung u. zu Einzelfragen der Ethik u. Lebenspraxis zu nennen, die teilweise der genus der Diatribe recht nahekommen, also etwa De ira. . ., De morte. . ., De oecon. . ., u. De vitiis. . . .".

263. The apparent size of the work, which allowed its division into books, seems to indicate that the de Morte actually is a treatise which contained at least one section written as a diatribe or as a consolatio in the diatribal style. Cf. Traudel Stork, Nil Igitur Mors Est ad Nos, Der Schlussteil des dritten Lukrezbuches und sein Verhältnis zur Konsolationsliteratur, (Bonn, 1970), who writes (p. 19) concerning Philodemus and the de Morte "er betrachtet das Todesproblem an Hand einer bestimmten Reihenfolge verschiedener Gesichtspunkte, die z. T. mit denen in Senecas de remediis fortuitorum übereinstimmen. Offenbar hat er diese Rubriken aus volkstümlichen Traktaten entnommen und in Sinn seines eigenen philosophischen Standpunktes zu einer entsprechenden Schrift einer Diatribe, ausgeführt." See also Stork, pp. 55-58, 70, 97-98, and passim for a discussion of themes found in the de Morte.

264. All quotations from columns XXXVII-XXXIX of the De Morte will be taken from the text edited, with Italian translation and commentary, by Marcello Gigante, in his Richerche Filodemee (Biblioteca della Parola del Passato, 6) Naples, 1969, pp. 77-122 ("La Chiusa del 'De Morte' di Filodemo"), and will be indicated in the text by column and line number.

Quotations from XIX-XXXVI will be taken from the edition by D. Bassi, Collectio Tertia (Papiri Ercolanesi), Milan (1914), and will be indicated in the text by column and line number. The present writer also has made use of the text by Siegfried Mekler (Vienna, 1886).

265. See the context to footnote 7 and following.

266. See the context to footnote 131 above and T. Stork, op. cit., p. 55.

267. Column XXVIII, line 13 ff. This quotation is identified by Mekler, op. cit., p. 36. Other poetic quotations are found in column XXVIII, 7 (Homer, Odyssey, XI, 201, identified by Mekler, p. 36),

XXXIII, 10 and 13 (Homer, Odyssey, V, 306-308 and 312; cf. Mekler, p. 42) and XXXVIII, 12-14 (according to Gigante, op. cit., p. 98, "Frammento tragico di poeta ellenistico, liberamente citato da Filodemo, I versi fanno parte di un piú vasto frammento tramandato da Diodoro Siculo (XVI 92.3) come recitato dall'attore tragico Neottolemo, per ordine di Filippo il Macedone. . . .").

268. See footnote 94 above; cf. T. Stork, op. cit., p. 58, who mentions the discussion of Bion concerning burial, but does not deal with the quotation from Euripides.

269. See the context to footnote 89 above concerning Bion's use of such exempla.

270. See Mekler, op. cit., p. 35, note to line 13; cf. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 49 (#25c), Diogenes Laertius, IV, 49, and the context to footnote 132 above for Bion's remark concerning the road to Hades.

271. See the context to footnote 265 above.

272. E. J. Kenney, Lucretius, De rerum natura, Book III (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge, 1971), p. 32. See also Sr. Mary Fern, The Latin Consolatio as a Literary Type (dissertation, St. Louis University, 1941), pp. 3 and 4.

273. Fern, op. cit., p. 4.

274. See T. Burgess, op. cit., p. 146 ff. on the epitaphios and T. Stork, op. cit., pp. 9 ff. Another important type of consolation literature which seems to have come into widespread use in the Hellenistic age (see Fern, op. cit., p. 4) is the epicedion, on which see J. Esteve-Forriol, Die Trauer-und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz (dissertation, Munich, 1962). Stork, op. cit., p. 21, observes that ". . .in den Gedichten die Mitklage im Vordergrang steht und der Dichter so der Trauer gegenüber eine positive Stellung einnimmt. . . ., "while" im Gegensatz dazu ist der Standpunkt der Verfasser eine Trostschrift etwas distanziert von Trauernden. Der consolator versucht von Anfang an und vor allem mit rationalen Argumenten auf den consolandus einzuwirken, um ihn von seiner Trauer zu befreien."

275. Paul Vallette, "Lucrèce et la Diatribe," Revue des Études Anciennes, 42 (1940), 532-41. E. J. Kenney, op. cit., p. 20, mentions this study in connection with Lucretius' use of the diatribal style.

276. See the quotation from T. Stork in footnote 263 above.

277. One of the motives of the "consolatio" section of an *epicedion*, for example, is, according to Esteve-Forriol, *op. cit.*, p. 152," Das Leben is nur ein Darlehen," a motive which Esteve-Forriol finds also in Ps. Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Apollonium* 116 A-B and 106 F and in Seneca, *Dialogi*, 6, 10.1 ff. and 12, 10.4-6. See also T. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 156, on the *epitaphios* and the theme "Death is common to all." Cf. Epicurus, Sent. Vat., fr. XXXI and Gigante, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-90.

278. One of the motives of the "laudatio" section of an epicedion and of funeral orations (see Esteve-Forriol, *op. cit.*, p. 133) dealt with "fecunditas."

To be added to this list of themes is col. XXV, 2-10 (mentioned by Stork, *op. cit.*, p. 70) which mentions those left behind by the dead.

279. The description of the funeral and the tomb was a standard motive of the *epicedion* and funeral oration. See Esteve-Forriol, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-147 and T. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 156 who mentions the theme, found in the consolatory section of an epitaphios, that those who die honorably, i. e. in his example, for their country, ". . . .gain the glory of a public funeral and the honor of games." Philodemus' discussion seems to be a reversal of this standard theme.

280. See the Ps. Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Apollonium* (ed. J. Hani, Etude et Comment., 78, 1972), 110C, where Euripides (Suppliants 1109) is quoted on those "

". . .τὰς μακρὰς νοσηλείας ὑπομενόντων . . . ."

281. See T. Stork, *op. cit.*, p. 56 for a discussion of this passage and Lucretius. Stork lists col. XXXII, 7-9, 15, 24, 30 ff. and col. XXXIII, 3-5 and 31, as passages related to this theme.

282. Fern, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5 observes "among the Epicureans were Metrodorus and Epicurus himself, the author of a consolation

περὶ Ἡγησιάνακτο τελευτῆς; the Peripatetics and Cyrenaics also treated this subject."

283. See Stork, *op. cit.*, p. 58, who comments on this passage in relation to Philodemus.

XUM

284. C. Wilke (ed., Philodemi De ira Liber, Leipzig, Teubner, 1914; p. LIII), following his analysis of the sources of the work, comments, "ut igitur his sententiis collatis quae conicere liceat paucis complectar, Philodemus vel potius Zeno, quem ille sectatur, cum iram describeret, omnia fere ex Chrysippi curatorio libro hausisse mihi videtur; his perpauca ex Epicureorum scholis addidit (v. p. XXXI); nonnulla denique lumina orationes ex Bione adspersit. atque Chrysippi etiam argumentationem in altera libri parte imitatus est, cum Epicuri doctrinam explanaret, col. 35.36. 44 (v. p. XXX). "See also p. Liv. This edition will be the source of all quotations from or references to the de Ira.

In view of the use of the diatribe style by Philodemus, the comment by P. Lejay (ed., Horace, Satires, Oeuvres d'Horace ed. F. Plessis et P, Lejay, Paris, 1911, p. xvii) that "la diatribe caractérise le cynisme et le stoicisme. An n'en trouve pas l'equivalent dans l'epicuréisme. . . .," seems too strong, unless one assumes that Lejay is referring only to the oral delivery of the genre and not to its written forms.

285. Wilke, op. cit., provides an analysis of the sources in his "Praefatio," pp. xxvi ff. and in the apparatus to his text.

286. See also H. Lausberg, op. cit., pp. 436 ff., who (p. 437) refers, among other examples, to Quintilian (IX, ii.47), who calls the figure antiphrasis and gives (among others) the following example, which involves a rhetorical question: Quid ego istius decreta, quid rapinas, quid hereditatum possessiones datas, quid ereptas profermam?

287. See above in the context following footnote 7, the context to footnotes 95-98, and the context of these notes.

288. Wilke, the editor of the De ira, identifies these quotations as well as all the others which will be listed as appearing in the De ira. Other references to Homer include VIII, 18-Iliad, XXIII, 21; and XLIV, 22-24-Iliad, IX, 63.

289. See, for example, Teles, p. 14.6-15.2, and 44.2 for Crates; 21.6-23.4 and 59.10 ff. for Stilpo; 8.3-5, 8.9-11, and 41.13-15 for Diogenes. Other references occur in anecdotes.

290. Basilides and Thespis also are mentioned (V, 21), on whom see Wilke, op. cit., p. xxvi.

291. The anecdote appears in more complete form in Plutarch, Moralia, 970 F, to which Wilke, op. cit., (p. 42, apparatus) refers.

XUM

292. Ragnar Höistad in his *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, *Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man* (dissertation, Uppsala, 1948; p. 179) notes that "Teles provides us with the earliest evidence of Cynic use of Alexander exempli gratia, *Hense*, Tel. Rel., p. 43, where Alexander is adduced as an example of man's insatiable striving after more and more, and ultimately after immortality." See also pp. 204-220 on other views of Alexander, and especially p. 207, where Höistad writes that in view of Teles' use of earlier Cynics, ". . .his parenthetic reference to Alexander is to be regarded as traditional."

293. Wilke, *op. cit.*, p. xvi, describes the content of col. XVI, 26-SVII, 15 as "ira recte brevis insania dicitur. . . ."

294. Wilke, *op. cit.*, p. 33, compares this passage with the following fragment of Chrysippus' *Peri pathon* (SVF, III, fr. 478, p. 129, 26-30):

> Πολλάκις δὲ κατὰ τὴν τοιαύτην τυφλότητα τὰς κλεῖς δάκνομεν, καὶ τὰς θύρας τύπτομεν, οὐ ταχὺ αὐτῶν ἀνοιγομένων, πρός τε τοὺς λίθους ἐὰν προσπταίσωμεν, τιμωρητικῶς προσφερόμεθα καταγνύντες καὶ ῥιπτοῦντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τινας τόπους, καὶ ἐπιλέγοντες καθ᾽ ἕκαστα τούτων ἀτοπώτατα.

This description reminds one of the *authades*, concerning whom Theophrastus writes (XV, 8.12 ff.)", . . .καὶ προσπταίσας ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δεινὸς καταράσασθαι τῷ λίθῳ· καὶ [ἀναμεῖναι] οὐκ ἂν ὑπομεῖναι πολὺν χρόνον οὐθένα·. . . ."

295. Wilke. *op. cit.*, p. 47, notes concerning XX, 23, ff., that Hense, in his *Teletis Reliquiae* (2nd. ed.; LXXII) attributes these lines to Bion. One should compare these with XXV, 22 ff. concerning the things which cease to be pleasant for the angry man.

296. The *Peri kakion* X, of course deals with several character types, unlike the *De Ira*, which describes various angry reactions and tries to set up an example of proper conduct (see Wilke, *op. cit.*, pp. xviii ff. for a summary of the latter). On the problem of whether the *De ira* belongs to the *Peri kakion* or to a similar work, see Wilke, p. VII. The *De ira* seems to be able to stand alone as a diatribe.

XUM

297. See Wilke, *op. cit.*, p. XVII, for a Latin summary of this and the preceding and following column.

Richard Heinze (ed., T. Lucretius Carus, *De rerum natura Buch* III, Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu Griechischen und Römischen Schriftstellern, Leipzig, 1897); p. 91) discusses the use of the lion and other animals as examples of temperament. Lucretius (ed. C. Bailey, Oxford, 1947; vol. I; see Heinze, p. 91) writes (III, 296-298):

> quo genere in primis vis est violenta leonum,
> pectora qui fremitu rumpunt plerumque gementes
> nec capere irarum fluctus in pectore possunt.

See also A. Oltramare, *Les Origines de la Diatribe Romaine* (Lausanne, 1926), p. 49, theme 30a, "Les *animaux* peuvent nous servir de modèles de simplicité," which, perhaps, is to be expanded to include the use of animal comparisons in general.

298. See Wilke, *op. cit.*, p. XV, who observes concerning this column that Philodemus "confert medici rationem: aegroti quoque omnibus curandi rationibus facilius obsequuntur, si compererint, quanta mala morbum sequantur. . . ." Columns II-XII are, as Wilke also notes (p. XV) a reply to the opponent whom Philodemus ridicules in column I.

This section is, of course, an analogy. On the Epicurean method of reasoning by analogy, see P. and E. DeLacy, *op. cit.*, pp. 138 ff. See also the *de Ira*, XLVI, 40-XLVII, 1-7, where Philodemus presents an analogy, drawn by other Epicureans, with which he later takes issue (XLVIII-XLIX; cf. Wilke, p. XX-XXI.).

299. Cf. Lucretius, III, 487-491:

> quin etiam subito vi morbi saepe coactus
> ante oculos aliquis nostros, ut fulminis ictu,
> concidit et spumas agit, ingemit et tremit artus,
> desipit, extentat nervos, torquetur, anhelat
> inconstanter, et in iactando membra fatigat.

300. A. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 61 lists both of these anecdotes as examples of diatribal themes.

301. See also SVF, III, fr. 483, 484, 485, and 488. Medical terminology is to be expected in a work containing (SVF, III, fr. 457)

302. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter der Römer* (paperback reprint edition, Georg Olms, *Hildesheim*, 1971; p. 367) records the saying, from Horace, Ep. I, 18.71, "Et semel emissum volat irreparabile verbum." Cf. the saying by Menander (fr. 1092 Koch; recorded by Otto p. 367),

> "Οὔτ᾽ ἐκ χερὸς μεθέντα καρτερὸν λίθον ῥᾷον κατασχεῖν,
>
> οὔτ᾽ ἀπὸ γλώσσης λόγον."

303. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 177, records the following fragment of Philemon (Fr. 184 Koch) which contains a somewhat similar view:

> Μαινόμεθα πάντες, ὁπόταν ὀργιζώμεθα.

In Seneca (Ep., XVIII, 14-15; Otto cites section 14 only) is found the following passage which includes the concept of anger as madness and a reference to love and hate (which is almost the opposite of the passage quoted from Philodemus' *de Ira*, XIV, 16-22):

> Delegabo te ad Epicurum, ab illo fiet numeratio: 'inmodica ira gignit insaniam.' Hoc quam verum sit necesse est scias, cum habueris et servum et inimicum. In omnes personas hic exardescit adfectus; tam examore nascitur quam ex odio, non minus inter seria quam inter lusus et iocos. (ed. L. D. Reynolds, Oxford, I, 1965).

304. For other examples, see fragment 1, 17-20; cols. XIV, 23-27; XVII, 20-23; XXI, 18-22; XXIV, 1-4; XXXII, 20-23.

305. For other examples see XXX, 26-28; XXXI, 32-33; XL, 28-29; XLIV, 9-10.

306. For other examples, see I, 9-12; XI, 5-7; XXXIII, 1-7; XLVI, 31-35, XLVIII, 5-12; XLIX, 15-22. Additional examples of homoeoptoton include fragment I, 14-17; cols. III, 5-10; XI, 5-7, XV, 27-29; XVIII, 19-21; XLVI, 22-25; XLVII, 23-25; XLVIII, 16-18.

307. See also XIV, 16-22; XLVIII, 5-12 and 24-28; XLI, 24-27.

308. See also fragment V, 21-24; cols. XIX, 27-33; XLIII, 29-34; XLIV, 40-XLV, 5; XLVIII, 16-20.

309. For other examples see XIX, 14-15; XXV, 10-12; XLVII, 23-25.

310. See also XXXIV, 24-27 (2 examples); XL, 15-19; XL, 29-31. On this

XUM

type of figure see the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, XXI.29 ff. on *adnominatio* and especially the example given in IV, XXII.30, "Demus operam, Quirites, ne omnino patres conscripti circumscripti putentur. . . .," which Quintilian (IX, iii.7) criticizes. Quintilian's treatment (IX, iii. 66 ff.) is more detailed. See also H. Lausberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 322 ff. on *annominatio* and *polyptoton*.

311. On the figure chiasmus see H. Lausberg, *op. cit.*, p. 361 and Leonid Arbusow, *Colores Rhetorici* (2nd. ed., ed. Helmut Peter, Göttingen, 1963), p. 81. Arbusow defines chiasmus as ". . .antithetische Vereinigung zweier Gegensatzpaare in symmetrischer Uberkreuzung. . . ." Another good example of the figure is found in Philodemus' *Peri parrhesias* (ed. A. Olivieri, Leipzig, Teubner, 1914), fragment, 1, 4-5, ". . .μήθ' ὃ συνφέρει διαγινώσ|κειν, ἀπ[ιστ]εῖν ποεῖ."

See also J. D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Composition* (Oxford, rep. ed. 1965), pp. 74-77 for other examples of Chiasmus in Greek prose literature.

312. See Denniston, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-74 on antithesis and symmetry in Greek style.

313. Schmid (*Ibid.*) further notes that both the "Letter to Herodotus" and the "Letter to Menoeceus" are ". . .von vornherein zur Publikation für weitere Leser bestimmt. . . .". See also Cesare Brescia, *Richerche Sulla Lingua e Sullo Stile di Epicuro* (Collana di Studi Greci diretta da Vittorio de Falco XXVI, Naples, 1955; pp.80-84) who records instances of hyperbaton, anacoluthon, chiasmus, periphrasis, and *iteratio* in the works of Epicurus. Hans Widmann, *Beiträge zur Syntax Epikurs* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, XXIV, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1935) mentions style only briefly (p. 237). Schmid, col. 714, comments briefly on both of these studies. See also Eduard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa* (Teubner, Leipzig, 1909, vol. 1, pp. 123-125); C. Joachim Classen, "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius," TAPA, 99 (1968) 111-113; P. H. Schrijvers, *Horror ac Divina Voluptas*, *Études sur la poetique et la poésie de Lucrèce* (Amsterdam, 1970), pp. 329-330.

314. The edition by Usener (*Epicurea*, Teubner, 1887) will be the source for all quotations.

315. Other examples of isocolon are found in 123, 8-10; 126, 1-2; 127, 1-2; 129, 4-5; 129, 11-12; 130, 5-7 (οὐχ ἵνα. . .ἀλλ' ὅπως); 132, 11-13.

XUM

316. Other examples of homoeoptoton include 125, 5; 126, 3-5; 127, 10-128.1; 130.3-4.

Homoeoteleuton additionally appears in many passages, such as 123, 8-10; 125, 10; 125, 12-126, 1; 126, 1-2 and 2-3; 126, 4-5; 128, 4-5.

317. See Classen, *op. cit.*, p. 111 on Epicurus and metaphor. The other two examples given here are based on the repetition of key words rather than on strictly syntactical considerations. Brescia, *op. cit.*, p. 81, lists section 122, 6-9 as an example of chiasmus (see above in the section concerning isocolon in Epicurus). The clause (127, 6-7), ". . .ἵνα μήτε πάντως προσμένωμεν ὡς ἐσόμενον μήτε ἀπελπίζωμεν ὡς πάντως οὐκ ἐσόμενον. . . ." provides an example of parallel structure which looks like chiasmus but does not quite complete the figure.

318. See Cyril Bailey, *Epicurus*, *the Extant Remains* (rep. ed., 1970, G. Olms, Hildesheim), p. 333.

319. Ettore Bignone, *L'Aristotele Perduto e la Formazione Filosofica di Epicuro*, I (in *Il Pensiero Classico*, IV, Firenze, 1936), p. 401. See also p. 400, concerning which Schrijvers, op. cit., p. 329, comments. Cf. Vincenz Buchheit, *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon von Gorgias bis Aristoteles* (Munich, 1960) pp. 109-110 (and the studies listed by him there).

320. T. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 230 (footnote).

321. Worthy of note here is the saying of Democritus (fr. 171, Stobaeus, Anth. II, 7, 3 i; quoted here from G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, Cambridge, 1971; p. 424, with commentary on p. 425),

"εὐδαιμονίη οὐκ ἐν βοσκήμασιν οἰκεῖ οὐδὲ ἐν χρυσῷ·
ψυχὴ οἰκητήριον δαίμονος."

322. For example, among the fragments of Antiphanes (fr. 209, Koch) A. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 109, has found the statement "θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἦν ἐκεῖνος." Otto (*Ibid.*) also lists the famous line from Catullus 51, 1 and the Sappho poem on which it is based in which appears the well-known lines (*Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, fr. 31, ed. E. Lobel and D. L. Page, Oxford, 1955)

φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν

ἔμμεν' ὤνηρ. . . .

Otto does not list the passages from Diogenes and Epicurus. Also to be added here is the saying of Democritus, number 37 (from E. Diels and W. Kranz, ed., *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 8th ed., 1956).

323. Cf. passim among the themes assembled by Oltramare, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-65.

324. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 106 lists this reference and comments that "two books of the satires of Menippus were expressly directed against the Epicureans and their reverence for the festival of their founder." On the Epicurean side, Philodemus ". . .castigating the immorality of the *Republic* of both Zeno and Diogenes, exclaims against those accursed beings who choose to live the lives of dogs." (Dudley, p. 107).

325. On whom (and on Cicero's remarks) see C. Joachim Classen, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-114; Benjamin Farrington, *The Faith of Epicurus* (London, Weidenfeld Goldbacks edition, 1969), p. 139; Marcello Gigante, *Ricerche Filodema* (Naples, 1969), pp. 15-18.

326. See the discussion of Horace, *Sermo* VII, and the topic "μόνος ὁ σοφὸς ἐλεύθερος καὶ πᾶς ἄφρων δοῦλος," in G.C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace*, *A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 7, Madison, 1920), pp. 405-408. See also Hirtzel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 389 and Norden, *op. cit.*, II, p. 755.

327. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-72 discusses the *Nekyia* and observes (p. 72) that "from the evidence of a passage of Diogenes Laertius which Cronert clearly shows to be based on the *Νεκυία*.

of Menippus it seems clear that the journey was made by Menippus himself by the aid of magic arts; and that its avowed object was to consult Tiresias is likely both from the Homeric original and the presumable echoes of Menippus in Horace and Lucian." Cf. W. Cronert, *Kolotes und Menedemos* (*Studien zur Paleographie und Papyruskunde*, Leipzig, 1906) p. 1 and footnote 1.

Dudley (*Ibid.*) further observes that the *Nekyia* was the model for Lucian in his *Dialogues of the Dead*, *Charon*, *Necyomanteia*, and the *Kataplous*, as well as for the *Menippus*.

XUM

All the passages from Lucian cited with this study are taken from the edition by C. Jacobitz, 3 vols., Teubner; 1871-74.

328. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 72. Dudley thinks it more likely that this work was composed of "pieces of humorous legislation" such as that found in Lucian's *Menippus* (20) and *Gods in Council* (14).

329. This reference is listed by D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 71, and by F. Susemihl, *op. cit.*, I, p. 45, note 141. See also Rudolf Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1906; p. 262), who comments, "es scheint danach, als ob auch bei Menipp ein Spassmacher auftrat, der einen eigenen Tanz, κόσμου ἐκπύρωσις gennant, aufführte.

Ob damit eine Verhöhnung Heraklits verbunden war, muss zweifelhaft bleiben."

The quotations from Athenaeus given here in the text have been taken from the edition by G. Kaibel (Leipzig, Teubner, 1890).

330. This reference is listed by D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 71 and by F. Susemihl, *op. cit.*, I, p. 45, note 141. Dudley (p. 73) comments that "the *Arcesilaus* is presumably directed against the first head of the Middle Academy, whose devotion to dialectic would earn him the contempt of the Cynics;. . . .".

331. The Strabo reference is listed by F. Susemihl, *op. cit.*, p. 45, note 141 (who also lists the second Lucian reference, in note 140) and by D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 70 (who gives the first Lucian reference, *Ibid.*). See also C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 56, Mary A. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 58; Norden, *op. cit.*, II, p. 755.

332. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 70. Dudley refers to the work of Rudolf Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig, 1906) and then gives an example, based on the "Sale of Creeds" by Lucian and the "Sale of Diogenes" by Menippus, to illustrate the hazards of this method.

333. Here one must allow, of course, for the influence of Greek romances and Roman satire in the case of these later writers.

334. See, however, Hirzel, *op. cit.*, I, p. 373, who comments, "die erwähnten Dialoge des Teles bidden hiergegen keinen Einwand, da in ihnen diese Form, so weit wir schen, nicht dazu diente, neue Resultate zu gewinnen, sondem nur die alten Sätze der kynischen Moral aufs Neue einzuschärfen."

335. Cf. Hirzel, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 373-374 and p. 380 (where he refers to ". . .das literarische Produkt dieser neuen Sophistik, die

XUM

Menippische Satire zum sokratischen Dialog." See also P. Lejay, *op. cit.*, p. XXIII, on "la comparaison dialoguée."

336. Fragment 516 of *Varronis Menippearum Reliquiae* in F. Buecheler, ed., *Petronii Saturae et Liber Priapeorum* (Berlin, 1922). This edition will be the source of all quotations from, or references to, the satires of Varro. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 70, quotes this passage (in a slightly different version without giving a reference).

337. Cf. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 56; C. W. Mendell, *op. cit.*, p. 143; Alexander Riese, ed., *M. Terenti Varronis Saturam Menippearum Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1865), p. 8. Riese (p. 7) records the statement by Macrobius (Sat. I, 11, 42), "Alii quoque non pauci servi fuerunt qui post philosophi clari extiterunt. ex quibus ille Menippus fuit, cuius libros M. Varro in satiris aemulatus est, quas alii cynicas, ipse apellat Menippeas." See also P. 228 in Riese's edition, fragment III (2) of the *Testamentum*, which reads "e mea φιλοφωνιᾳ natis, quos Menippea haeresis nutricata est, tutores do 'qui rem Romanam Latiumque angiscere vultis.'"

Concerning the title of Varro's satires C. A. van Rooy (pp. 55-56) comments that "according to the 'Index librorum Varronis' of St. Jerome, Varro wrote not only 150 books of *Saturae Menippeae* (no 38: 'satyrarum Menippearum libri cl'), but also 4 books of *Saturae* (no. 39: satyrarum libri iiii'). Though it cannot be *proved* that the Index derives directly from Varro, we have no reason to doubt the authenticity of these titles, and in regard to the first of these works at any rate we have the definite testimony of Aulus Gellius that Varro called it *Saturae Menippeae*." Cf. Francesco della Corte *Varrone, il terzo gran lume romano* (Firenze, 2nd ed., 1970), Appendix, pp. 238-259; G. L Hendrickson, "The Provenance of Jerome's Catalogue of Varro's Works," *Classical Philology* 6 (1911), 334 ff. (I owe these references to Prof. Daniel J. Taylor).

338. This reference is mentioned and commented upon by Eugene Wildenow, *De Menippo Cynico* (dissertation Universities of Halle and Wittenberg, 1881), p. 31. See also Ulrich Knoche, *Die Römische Satire* (Göttingen, 1957), p. 34. Francesco della Corte, *Varrone, il terzo gran lume romano* (Firenze, 2nd. ed., 1970; p. 46).

339. Cf. Michel Ruch, *Le Préambule dans les Oeuvres Philosophique de Cicéron* (Paris, 1958), pp. 67-68 and E. Norden, *In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae* (Leipzig, 1891), p. 321.

340. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 102 lists fr. 518 and 85 (apparently a misprint for 84).

341. For examples of the second person see fragments 23, 72, 79, 100, 106, 107, 115.

342. See the discussion of satura as used by Varro in C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., pp. 55-59.

343. See also fragment 506 where Fortuna is addressed along with Ceres, Minerva, and other dieties, in an apostrophe. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 14, lists an example from Crates (from H. Diels, Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta, Berlin, 1901, p. 223) which he calls a personification and which is, in addition (which he does not mention) an apostrophe. See also E. Norden, In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae (Leipzig, 1891), pp. 344 ff. Personifications should not be confused, of course, with metaphors such as that in the remark of Diogenes of Sinope, who, according to Diogenes Laertius (VI, 50, "τὴν φιλαργυρίαν εἶπε μητρόπολιν πάντων τῶν κακῶν."

344. The distinction between prosopopoiia and somotopoiia may not be necessary, if one assumes that the latter is only a sub-class of the former. In the definition given by P. Rutilius Lupus (Schemata Lexeos, in Rhetores Latini Minores, ed. C. Halm, Leipzig, Teubner, 1863, rep. 1964; p. 15) one finds mention of action or words (". . .actionem sermonemue. . .") given to the personification, a departure from the definitions of the Rhetorica ad Herennium (see above at footnote 104) and Quintilian (I, viii, 3; III, viii, 49 and 52; VI, i, 25; IX, ii, 29-37) who, however, includes Vergil's personification of Fama (see Quintilian, IX, ii. 36) and does observe (IX, ii. 37) "vertitur interim προσωποποιία in speciem narrandi." Perhaps, then, Servius' term represents a late, but useful, distinction, which the present writer thinks should be included here as a convenient means of distinguishing between the spoken prosopopoiia and the simple use of personification.

Prof. Luitpold Wallach kindly called my attention to the term somotopoiia in Cassiodorus, a reference which, according to L. Wallach, also is used in the Libri Carolini, II, 4. Other figures mentioned by Cassiodorus are listed by Garet in J. P. Migne, Patrologia Latina, 70, 1279. For other examples of the term see H. Stephanus, Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, VII, 1718-1719 and G. Forcellini, Lexicon Totius Latinitatis, IV, 416.

345. Cf. also the views of Euhemerus of Messene, concerning whom A. Lesky (A History of Greek Literature, tr. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer, London, 1966) observes (p. 781), "but the fact should not be overlooked that Euhemerus represents only one point, though a notable one, along the line of a rationalizing interpre-

XUM

tation of mythology which we can follow from Hecataeus of Miletus and Stesimbrotus onward. A similar line runs from the sophists to Euhemerus." See also Cicero, *De natura deorum*, I, 15.38 ff. (ed. O. Plasberg, Teubner, 1968) on the view of Persaeus the Stoic and Chrysippus.

346. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 33 cites and translates this passage from Stobaeus, *Florilegium* (*Anthologium*, XXIX, *Peri philoponias*, 92, ed. Otto Hense, Berlin, 1894, III; p. 655).

347. Erich Woytek, "Stilistische Untersuchungen zur Satura Menippe Varros," *Eranos*, 70 (1972), p. 30, cites this saying in a section concerning parallelism in Varro's style.

348. See S. F. Bonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 9, 22 and 27; cf. Oltramare, pp. 103 and 106 ff. on Varro's insertion of Roman ideals into his Menippean satires.

349. Cf. Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957, rep. 1966), p. 90 ff. and Richard Heinze, *de Horatio Bionis Imitatore* (dissertation, Bonn, 1889), pp. 6-7.

350. See also Oltramare's list of themes concerning the sage (pp. 57-59), which includes "La fortune n'a pas de prise sur le sage" (p. 57), "Le sage défie la fortune" (p. 57), and "Le sage est *reconnaissant d'avoir été frappé* par le sort" (p. 58).

351. Cf. E. Norden, *In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1891, p. 268.

352. For diatribal themes concerning wealth, see Oltramare, p. 47 (themes 20 ff.) and p. 54 (theme 46a); on supersition, see *Ibid.*, pp. 64-65 (themes 92-94).

353. A Cynic commonplace could have been influential here, although it need not have been. See Oltramare, p. 51, theme 33, "il faut revenir à la vertu des sociétés primitives."

354. Cf. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 56, who notes that Varro's ". . .medleys are essentially polemical in spirit. For though he sometimes blends jest with earnest in the cynic manner, his work is not born of 'hilaritas' like that of Menippus, but of a typically Roman 'gravitas'; and though he lacks the 'acrimonia' of Lucilius, yet like Lucilius he directs himself with 'severitas' against the 'luxuria' and corrupt social and political life of his time. . . .".

355-6. See also Erich Woytek, "Stylistische Untersuchungen zur Satura Menippea Varros," *Eranos*, 70 (1972) 39 ff. on alliteration. Woytek includes fr. 56. (The Ennius quotation is taken from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xii.18). Varro's style in the

XUM

Menippeans should be compared with his style in other works. Cf. Collart, *op. cit.*, in footnote 362, p. 336-340 on the style of the *De Linqua Latina* (I owe this reference to Prof. Daniel J. Taylor).

357. See also fragments 3, 22, 38, 262 and others; cf. Woytek, *op. cit.*, p. 39 ff., and by the same author, *Sprachliche Studien zur Satura Menippea Varros* (Wiener Studien, Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie und Patristik, Beiheft 2, 1970, Wien), pp. 91-92.

358. For other examples, see fr. 13, 33, 205, 241, 283, 316.

359. For a similar example, see fr. 429. Other examples of homoeoteleuton are found in fr. 75, 81, 219, 213, 298, 429. See also Woytek, "Stilistische Untersuchungen," pp. 44 ff.

360. Woytek, *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29, gives these examples, to which should be added fr. 71, 75 and 283 as samples of the use of this figure. See also E. Norden, *In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae*, p. 279 (hereafter cited as *Observationes*).

361. Woytek, "Stilistische Untersuchungen," p. 32 includes fr. 356 and fr. 469 (misprinted as 496) as example of chiasmus. See also Norden, *Observationes*, pp. 281 ff. on the imitations of poets found in the *Onos Lyras* from which fr. 356 comes.

362. Cf. William Dudley Woodhead, *Etymologizing in Greek Literature from Homer to Philo Judaeus* (dissertation, University of Chicago; published by The University of Toronto Press, 1928), pp. 82-83. See also Jean Collart, *Varron grammarien latin* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 121, Paris, 1954), pp. 251-302.

363. Woytek, "Stilistische Untersuchungen," p. 51, includes both of these examples. Cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xxi.29, where one example of *adnominatio* is "Hic sibi posset temperare, nisi amori mallet obtemperare."

364. Woytek, *Ibid.*, p. 58, also has noticed this example. The *figura etymologica*, of course, is closely related, if not indeed a special form of, the figure *traductio* which the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, XIV.20, defines as "Traductio est quae facit uti, cum idem verbum crebrius ponatur, non modo non offendat animum, sed etiam concinniorem orationem reddat. . . .". This relationship is indicated by Heinrich Fichtenau, in his "Rhetorische Elemente in der ottonisch-salischen Herrscherurkunde," (*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, LXVIII, 1960), p. 56, a study which includes excellent summaries and examples of many other figures (I am indebted to Prof. L. Wallach, who kindly called my attention to this study). For a comprehensive study of the figura etymologica cf. Gustav Landgraf, *De figuris etymologicis linguae latinae* in *Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis*, 2 (1881), 1-69.

XUM

Other wordplays, falling under the heading of the figure paronomasia, are listed by Woytek, "Slitistische Untersuchungen," pp. 51-52, 54 ff.

365. Cf. E. Norden, Observationes, p. 279. See above at footnote 121 and 122.

366. This fragment should be compared with Oltramare, p. 64, theme 92a, "Toute crainte causée par des croyances d'anthropomorphisme doit être écartee," and p. 65, theme 94, "Toute croyance aux oracles et aux devins est ridicule." Varro's satire Hekatombe or Peri Thusiōn (fr. 94-100) probably also dealt with these or similar themes.

367. Cf. Teles, pp. 55 ff. on apatheia and Oltramare, p. 45, theme II, "La tranquillité de l'âme (adiaphorie) donne le bonheur."

368. This last fragment (447) is also, as Oltramare notes (p. 104), an example of "les avantages hygiéniques de la frugalité," although the idea of the need for philosophy seems to underlie this passage, in a fashion similar to its use by Philodemus (see above at footnotes 298 and Teles, p. 39.1-4).

369. Cf. Oltramare, p. 108, note 3, and E. Norden, Observationes, p. 337, note 1.

370. See also Augustine, De civitate Dei, VI, 10 on Varro's attitudes.

371. Oltramare, p. 109, note 2 lists fragment 529 as well as 54, 55, and 315. He omits fr. 530. Further, Oltramare observes that the satire Peri Edesmaton was aimed ". . .contre la science des gourmets."

372. Oltramare, pp. 108-109 lists and comments on all of these examples, comparing the fragments concerning dress and perfume with themes 39 "Il faut éviter le luxes des vêtements," 38a "il faut éviter le luxe des bijoux.," and 39b, "il faut éviter tout raffinement de toilette.," on p. 52. The fragments concerning the ornamentation of homes are compared by him (p. 109) to themes 35c, "Il faut passer de pavages en riches mosaiques," and 37, "il faut éviter le luxe de mobilier," to which one could add theme 35, "il faut fuir le luxe des habitations."

373. Oltramare, p. 108, mentions this fragment; cf. Peter Lenkeit, Varros Menippea 'Gerondidaskalos,' dissertation Köln, 1966, p. 62.

374. See also Norden, Observationes, Ibid., on the story concerning Diogenes and his slave, found in Dio Chrysostom, Or. 10, 296 R. A cynic theme thus could be involved here.

375. Earlier in this same chapter Augustine calls the pagan gods ". . .inmundissimos spiritus et malignissimos ac fallacissimos

daemones, usque adio, ut aut veris aut fictis etiam, suis tamen criminibus delectentur, quae sibi celebrari per sua festa voluerunt, ut a perpetrandis damabilibus factis humana revocari non possit infirmitas, dum ad haec imitanda velut divina praebetur auctoritas."

376. Varro's works are listed by Henry Bardon, La Littérature Latine Inconnue, I, L'Epoque Républicaine (Paris, 1952), p. 291.

On the list itself, cf. Friedrich Ritschl, "Die Schriftstelterei des M. Terentius Varro," Rheinisches Museum, VI (481-560), della Corte, op. cit., pp. 238-259 (I owe these references to Prof. Daniel J. Taylor). Cf. footnote 337.

377. Cf. C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., pp. 56-57; Ulrich Knoche, Die Römische Satire (Göttingen, 1957), p. 34. The present writer intends to deal with this topic in another study.

378. See Charles Witke, Latin Satire, The Structure of Persuasion (Leiden, 1970), pp. 156-157.

379. On the relationship between Cynicism and Stoicism see J. M. Rist, Stoic Philosophy (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 54-80 and passim. Important differences in the study of logic and physics, of course, increased the divergence between the two schools, although the Stoic Ariston of Chios held views in many ways closer to Cynicism than to Stoicism (see Rist, Ibid.; D. R. Dudley, op. cit., pp. 100-102.

380. This fragment is listed and discussed in reference to Gregory by Henrik M. Werhahn, ed., Gregorii Nazianzeni ΣΥΓΚΡΙΣΙΣ ΒΙΩΝ (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, 15, Wiesbaden, 1953), pp. 86-88. Prof. L. Wallach kindly called my attention to this volume which also includes a discussion of the diatribe and its use by Gregory. Von Arnim (SVF, III, fr. 710) lists this passage among the fragments of Chrysippus. The text of this fragment is taken from Werhahn, p. 86.

381. Horace, Opera, ed. Friderick Klingner, Teubner, Leipzig, 1959; this passage is listed by G. C. Fiske, op. cit., p. 387. See also D. R. Dudley, op. cit., p. 120 and Horace, Sermones, I, i.14, on Fabius and I, i.120; iii, 139; iv.14; II, vii, 45 on Crispinus; Oltramare, op. cit., pp. 127 ff.

382. From the edition by W. V. Clausen (Oxford, 1959) cf. Gilbert Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, a Study (Oxford University Press, New York, Galaxy Book edition, 1961; first published 1954) pp. 59 ff.

XUM

383. This reference is listed by Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, *Greece and Rome*, I, part II (revised ed., Image Books, Garden City, New York, 1962), p. 183. To the passages cited should be compared Cicero (*De natura deorum*, I, 3) who gives no information concerning public exhortations, but speaks of private discussions when he says, "quod et orationes declarant refertae philosophorum sententiis et doctissimorum hominum familiaritates, quibus semper domus nostra floruit, et principes illi Diodotus Philo Antiochus Posidonius, a quibus instituti sumus."

384. The statement ". . . ὁ χρύσιππος παρὰ τῷ κλεάνθει πεποιῆσθαι τὰς διατριβάς (sil. λέγεται)," from Origen (*Contra Celsum,* II, 12; SVF, II, 21) provides no information and probably does not refer to diatribes in the meaning "speeches."

385. George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, 1963), p. 291, translates this passage as well as the Quintilian passage mentioned above. Kennedy comments on Cicero's statement concerning Chrysippus and Cleanthes on rhetoric, "Cicero may have in mind the fact that the Stoics sometimes enjoined silence, cf. *Academics*, 2.93." Kennedy also refers (on p. 295) to the Fronto passage, which the present writer has noticed independently in Von Arnim.

386. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, p. 295, lists and comments on this reference.

387. See also Max Polenz, *Die Stoa*, *Geschichte eine geistigen Bewegung* (Göttingen, 1948), p. 144 who comments that "Medea sieht ein, was sie für ein Unheil vollbringen wird; ober es ist doch ihre verstandesmässige Entscheidung, wenn sie ihrem Hass gegen Iason folgt." Additional quotations from Euripides are found in SVF, III, fr. 467 (p. 119) 475 (p. 126), and fr. 478 (p. 128); for Homeric quotations see fr. 467 (p. 119.1), 478 (p. 129.3). For a quotation from Menander see SVF, III, fr. 390.

388. On Homer parody in antiquity see Vinzenz Buchheit, "Homerparodie und Literarkritik in Horazens Satiren I 7 und I 9," *Gymnasium* 75 (1968) 519-555.

389. See, for example, Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (*Ethica Nicomachea*, ed. F. Susemihl, 2nd. ed. by Otto Apelt, Leipzig, 1903) where the characters Odysseus and Neoptolemos from Sophocles' *Philoctetes* are mentioned (1146a21, 1151b20), as is Euripides' character Alcmaeon (1110a28), while quotations are taken from Euripides (1142a2 ff.) and Homer (passim-such as 1108a31). See also various examples in Plato (such as *Politeia*,

III, 390E, where Hesiod is quoted; cf. Hesiod, *Fragmenta Selecta*, ed. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, Oxford, 1970; fr. 361, p. 223).

390. On Chrysippus' views see M. Polenz, *Die Stoa*, I, pp. 143 ff. See also M. Polenz, *De Posidonii libris*

(Commentatio ex supplemento vicesimo quarto annalium philologiconum seorsum expressa, Leipzig, Teubner, 1898), pp. 537 ff. and passim.

391. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79, discusses Diogenes and the virtues of style; cf. Charles N. Smiley, *Latinitas and*

Ἑλληνισμός, dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1906, pp. 211 ff.; SVF, III, fr. 24, p. 214. See footnote 169 above on Theophrastus and the Peripatetic virtues of style; cf. SVF, II, fr. 289 and 290.

392. G. C. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 84. Since the theories of Panaetius which appear in Cicero's *De officiis* have been discussed ably by Fiske and Smiley, *op. cit.*, the following discussion will rely heavily on these two works, as well as on Mary Grant, *op. cit.*, passim, and will cite references to these works within the body of this study by using only the author's last name and page number. The edition of *De officiis* by C. Atzert, (Teubner, 4th. ed., 1963) will be the source for all references and quotations.

On Cicero's use of Panaetius in the *De officiis* cf. Modestus van Straaten, *Panetius*, *sa vie, ses écrits et sa doctrine avec une édition des fragments* (Amsterdam, 1946), fragments 116 (p. 365; Gellius, *Noct. Att.* XIII, 28), 34 (p. 332; Cicero, *Ep. ad. Att.* XVI, 11.4) and 35 (p. 332; Cicéro, *De officiis*, III, 2, 7-10). Further references to this volume also will be cited in the body of this paper by the author's last name with page and fragment numbers.

393. D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, p. 90-91, quotes this passage and comments, after listing the five virtues of style of Diogenes of Babylon, "from Cicero we gather that Panaetius repudiated the Cynic παρρησία as an offence against decency. 'Cynicorum vera ratio tota est eicienda: est enim inimica verecundiae, sine qua nihil recte est potest, nihil iucundum.' The φόρτικα ὀνόματα of Bion were doubtless included with the 'obscena verba' of Diogenes in this condemnation. The phrase καὶ πολὺς . . . χρώμενος

taken as a whole, suggests a charge of βωμολοχία scurrilous jesting, which Cicero, again following Panaetius, describes as 'illiberale, petulans, flagitiosum, obscenum.' The 'theatrical' nature of Bion's style was inappropriate for philosophy, and hence offended against τὸ πρέπον; the φόρτικα ὀνόματα violated the canon of Ἑλληνισμός, which does not employ 'the language of the streets' (μὴ εἰκαίᾳ συνηθείᾳ) and of κατασκευή, which is λέξις ἐκπεφευγυῖα τὸν ἰδιωτισμόν. The inference is therefore that these criticisms of Bion's style come from a period when the adherents of the Stoic theory of the Plain Style were rejecting the παρρησία of the Cynics for the εὐτραπελία of the Socratic writers."

Dudley-Ciceronian quotations are from De officiis I, 148 and I, 128.

394. In Von Arnim SVF, III, pp. 210-243 is found no fragment which refers to anything resembling a diatribe composed by Diogenes of Babylon. The fragments of Panaetius, as collected by van Straaten, op. cit., pp. 325, reveal only Panaetius' fondness for the Platonic style (cf. fr. 83 and 128), but cf. p. 57. On Posidonius see Marie Laffranque, Poseidonius de'Apamée, Essai de Mise au Point (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Paris, Série "Recherches," XIII, Paris, 1964), especially pp. 99-108 on the works of the Stoic.

See also C. W. Mendell, "Satire as Popular Philosophy," Classical Philology 15 (1920) 141-142.

395. Paul Lejay, ed., Horace, Satires (Oeuvres d'Horace ed. F. Plessis et P. Lejay, Paris, 1911), p. 381, includes this comment by Porphyrion to line 187 of Serm., II, iii (cf. Pomponi Porfyrionis commentum in Horatium Flaccum, ed. A. Holder, Teubner, 1894, rep. 1967). This work by Lejay hereafter will be cited by the author's last name and the page number. See G. C. Fiske, op. cit., pp. 389 ff. on the use of this same theme by Varro (in his Eumenides) and by Lucilius. The present study will not attempt to discuss all of the sources of Horace beyond the Cynic and Stoic commonplaces used.

On the connection between Horace's Sermones in general and the diatribal tradition cf. G. C. Fiske, op. cit., pp. 56 and

178 ff.; R. Heinze, *De Horatio Bionis imitatore*, (Bonn, 1889), passim; U. Knoche, *op. cit.*, p. 49; C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-66. See also Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957, rep. 1966), pp. 92-94 on *Serm.*, I, i.

The source for all quotations and references to Horace will be the edition by F. Klingner (*Horatius*, *Opera*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1959).

396. See C. Joachim Classen, "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius," TAPA 99 (1968) 89 on the treatment of the listener by Lucretious.

397. On Stoic logic cf. I. M. Bocheński, *Ancient Formal Logic* (Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Amsterdam, 1951), pp. 80-99; Benson Mates, *Stoic Logic*, University of California Press, Berkeley, paperbound edition, 1961 (first published in 1953 in University of California Publications in Philosophy, 26), pp. 10-41. On audience appeal, see Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica*, I, 1357a. See also Lejay, pp. 358-360 on logic within this satire, especially p. 360 when he mentions Cicero's comments in *De finibus*, IV, 7, quoted above at footnote 385. The famous remark by Zeno (SVF, I, 75) comparing rhetoric to an open hand as opposed to the closed fist of dialectic also is applicable here.

398. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 132 points out the hyperbole in this passage. Also obvious is the use of asyndeton (73) coupled with the reduplication of *modo* (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xxviii.38). cf. Lejay; p. 403.

399. Lejay, p. 406, assigns the question to Stertinus, observing, "cette question, mise ordinairement sur les lèvres de Damasippe, interrompt d'une manière inattendue et inopportune le discours de Stertinus. Il est plus conforme aux intentions due poète, de laisser ces mots à Sterlinus. Apres *vidisse*, il fait une pause pour exciter la curiosité, et il reprend avec emphase. . . ."

400. Cf. *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, *Satiren*, ed. Adolf Kiessling, 7th ed. by Richard Heinze (Berlin, 1959), p. 233 (hereafter to be cited as Kiessling and Heinze). Kiessling and Heinze observe that "die Anekdote, die hier als typisch für des Sokratikers Aristipp Geringschätzung des Geldes erzählt wird, mag H. aus Bion kennen:

τοῦ δὲ Θεράποντος ἐν ὁδῷ βαστάζοντος ἀργύριον καὶ βαρυνομένου, ὥς φασιν οἱ περὶ τὸν βίωνα ἐν ταῖς Διατριβαῖς, ἀπόχει ἔφη τὸ πλέον καὶ ὅσον δύνασαι βάσταζε."

XUM

401. These comments represent the present writer's interpretation of Lejay who discusses Stoic logic, following U. Brochard, "Sur la logique des Stöiciens," Archiv für Geschichte der Philolosophie 5 (1892) 450 ff.

402. Cf. Benson Mates, op. cit., p. 2, note 4; Jan Lukasiewicz, Aristotle's Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic (Oxford, 1951), pp. 1-3, 21, and 48. While Lukasiewicz insists that the Aristotelian syllogistic form consisted of a single proposition in conditional form, William and Martha Kneale, in The Development of Modern Logic (Oxford, 1962, rep. 1964; pp. 80-81), argue that, ". . .although Aristotle propounded his syllogistic principles in statements of the conditional form, it seems certain that he regarded use of this form as no more than one device among others for saying that certain premisses allow inference to certain conclusions. Unlike Lukasiewicz, he did not think of his syllogistic theory as presupposing a more fundamental part of logic which deals with the notions of conditionality and negation." (I am indebted to Prof. R. G. Wengert, who kindly called my attention to this work by Kneale and Kneale.) This controversy cannot be discussed further here, but the use of the conditional form by Aristotle in his models for syllogisms (in the Prior Analytics) seems to elimitate the possibility of assuming that the use of conditional sentences automatically implies underlying Stoic logical theories.

403. On the epicheireme see W. Kroll, "Das Epicheirema," Sitzungsberichte, Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien (Philos.-histor. Klasse) 216 (1936) 5 ff., cited by H. Caplan, Rhetorica ad Herennium (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, 1954), p. 107, note b. Concerning the enthymeme, cf. William M. A. Grimaldi, S. J., Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric (Hermes Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie, Einzelschriften, Heft 25, 1972, and Friedrich Solmsen, "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric," Kleine Schriften, II (Hildesheim, 1968), p. 182 ff.; Demetrius, Peri hermeneias (ed. L. Radermacher, Teubner, 1901, rep. 1967) 30.

404. For this scheme and the definition of mood see Benson Mates, op. cit., pp. 66-67 and 69-70; cf. Lejay, pp. 358-359; I. M. Bocheński, Ancient Formal Logic (Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Amsterdam, 1951), p. 98. Lejay seems to have this scheme in mind when he discusses this section, but the present writer cannot agree with his application of it.

XUM

405. Cf. Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica* 1357a16-20 and F. Solmsen, op. cit., p. 182. The omission of the conclusion is not mentioned by Aristotle and perhaps is a later habit. See also Cicero *De inventione*, I, XL.74 (the edition by E. Stroebel, Teubner, rep. 1965, will be the source for all quotations from and references to the *De inventione* in this study), who argues against the idea that an argument may consist of only one part. The argumentation in this section of the Horatian satire, further, resembles the five part argument or epicheireme, described in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II, XVIII.28, as consisting of ". . .propositionem, rationem, rationis confirmationem, exornationem, conplexionem," but here are found only a combination of proposition and reason followed by a section of amplification.

Concerning this section see also Kiessling and Heinze on the Stoic use of examples for proof (pp. 233-234).

406. On the attitude toward slaves see the comments about this section in Kiessling and Heinze, pp. 236-237.

407. On the diatribal connections of this theme cf. Gustav A. Gerhard, *Phoinix von Kolophon* (Teubner, 1909), p. 199.

Kiessling and Heinze (p. 238) call attention to the wordplay with *Opimius* and *opimus* and note "um dieses Wortspieles willen steht *pauper* daneben zur Charakteristik des *magnas inter opes inops* (od. III 16, 28)." This type of wordplay is typical of the popularized style. Interesting also is the word "tisanarium" (155), concerning which Lejay says (p. 414)"*tisana* est une forme populaire, devenue courante, du grec πτισάνη."

408. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines the figure *transitio* (IV, xxxvi.35) as ". . .quae cum ostendit breviter quid dictum sit, proponit item brevi quid consequatur. . . .". This passage seems to fulfill those requirements.

409. Cf. Fiske, p. 388 on reasoning by example; J. L. Stocks, "Epicurean Induction," *Mind*, 34 (1925), p. 195 and 199 on reasoning by signs; De Lacy and De Lacy, *op. cit.*, pp. 161, 164 ff., and bibliography, pp. 183-187.

410. Cf. A. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 53 on proverbs concerning *barathrum*. Otto includes a reference to line 59 of this satire ("'hic fossa est ingens, hic rupes maxima: serva!'"), which is especially interesting in that that passage concerns the type of person who

XUM

is too reckless, just as the passage concerning the barathrum (166-167) concerns the audax. See also Kiessling and Heinze who compare lines 166-167 with Teles, p. 37.6 ff.

411. Concerning this story Lejay (p. 417) observes that the character involved, Servius Oppidius, is ". . .inconnu d'ailleurs, peut-être un chevalier romain. Les Stoïciens, comme les prédicateurs populaires, aimaient à couper d'historiettes leurs discours. Celle-ci doit être un souvenir d'enfance qu'Horace prête sans scrupule à Stertinus. Oppidius était, comme Ofellus, un homme de la génération précédente, celle de Sulla."

There seems to be no need, however, to assume that the story of Oppidius is true. The important thing is that it seems true and expresses its theme in a manner convincing to the audience, making use of "fertur" to indicate some anonymous (and probably non-existent) source.

412. On last advice as a topos of consolatory literature cf. José Esteve-Forriol, Die Trauer-und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz (dissertation Munich, 1962), p. 143.

413. See Lejay, p. 420 on this proverb ". . .peut-être tiré d'une fable;" cf. Otto, op. cit., p. 189 and 379 on proverbs concerning wolves.

414. Ennius also wrote a play concerning Ajax (cf. Lejay, p. 420) but only four lines remain and provide no indication of scene construction (see Warmington, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 226-228 for fragments). See Fiske, op. cit., pp. 9-58 on methods of imitation.

415. See also S. F. Bonner, Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire (Liverpool, 1949, rep. 1969), pp. 15 and 23-25. The Orestes myth was also a stock example, and, thus, the rhetorical tradition may have influenced Horace in his use of this myth in lines 132 ff. (cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 244). On the Orestes myth and rhetoric cf. S. F. Bonner, Ibid., Rhetorica ad Herennium I, x.17; Cicero, de Inventione, I, xiii.18-19 and xlix.92.

416. Cf. Bonner, op. cit., p. 140 and Annaei Senecae Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae Divisiones Colores, ed. Adolf Kiessling (Teubner, 1967, editio stereotypa editionis primae (1872)), p. 23, suasoria III "Deliberat Agamemnon an Iphigeniam inmolet negante Calchante aliter navigari fas esse."

417. Cf. Ragnar Höistad, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, *Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man*, Uppsala, 1948, pp. 94 ff.; Diogenes Laertius, VI, 15.

418. Concerning antithesis as a figure of thought as well as speech, cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xlv.58 on *contentio*.

419. This concern for burial, used to show the character of Agamemnon, is in direct contrast to the attitude expressed by Bion when he quotes the words of Polyneices (Teles, p. 30.2 ff.; see above at footnote 130 ff., cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 244 who mention this passage in Bion only as an example of the use of an example and of dialogue).

420. On the use of examples as proof by the Stoics cf. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 388 and M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius and Kallimachos* (Frankfurt am Main, 1949), p. 102. The influence of rhetoric on the use of such examples cannot be excluded from consideration.

421. Stertinus' argument here resembles the five part argument (epicheireme) described in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (II, xviii. 28-xix.30), but is of a much looser construction. See also the five part argument outlined by Cicero (in *De inventione*, I, xxxiv.57-xli.77, ed. E. Stroebel, Teubner, rep. 1965) which follows a pattern more closely allied to logic. See literature cited above in footnote 403. Cf. C. J. Classen, *op. cit.*, p. 83 on Lucretius and persuasion.

422. Kiessling and Heinze (p. 248) emphasize the view of Agamemnon as a tyrant when, after mentioning the representation of the sacrifice of Iphigenia in Lucretius (I, 83 ff.), they comment ". . .der Stoiker dagegen legt das Gewicht auf den Zweck des Opfers, die Ermöglichung der Abfahrt von Aulis (208) und führt den zug gegen Troja auf die Ruhmbegier des Agamemnon zurück (212), entsprechend der Vorstellung, die sich die Popularphilosophie hellenistischer zeit von der φιλοδοξία des Tyrannen macht." See also p. 247 for comments on *species* (in line 208) and its relationship to Stoic thought and to Agamemnon's *philodoxia*.

Lejay (p. 420) observes concerning the whole discussion that "ces discussions étaient aussi des thèmes favoris pour les rhéteurs et les philosophes. . .," but he does not mention the *topos* of a confrontation between sage and king.

XUM

See also Friedmar Kühnert, "'Ambitio' in der römischen Satire" (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, Jahrgang SV, 1966, Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, Heft 4/5, Römische Satire), 485-488, especially p. 486, on the theme of *ambitio* in this section.

423. See above at footnote 396 ff.; cf. C. J. Classen, *op. cit.*, p. 89; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, I, iv.7; Cicero, *De inventione*, I, xvi.23.

424. For the fragments of this satire cf. Fiske, p. 393, who lists fragments 732, 729, 730, 737, 734, 731, 732, 735 from the edition by F. C. Marx (*Lucili Carmina Reliquiae*, 2 vols., Teubner, 1904-1905); cf. Lucilius, *Satiren*, *Lateinesch und Deutsch*, ed. Werner Krenkel (2 vols., Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1970), fr. 700 ff. (vol. II, p. 396 ff.).

425. The matter is complicated further by the possibility that Terence himself was influenced by the themes of the diatribe. Cf. A. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 73, who notes "les maximes, dont il aime à parsemer ses dialogues sont apparentées à la morale sociale des Péripatéticiens; ce n'est guère que dans l'*Eunuchus* qu'une série de vers contre les courtisanes et la passion de l'amour paraît remonter à une source philosophique plus populaire." Oltramare connects lines 59 ff. with the theme "*Les passions* asservissent . . ." (p. 63).

426. On the Stoic attitude toward love cf. E. Vernon Arnold, *Roman Stoicism* (Cambridge, 1911) pp. 317 ff. who cites Diogenes Laertius VII, 129-130 (and see also 131) and Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, IV.xxxiv.72; Max Polenz, *Die Stoa*, I (Gottingen, 1947), pp. 148, 165.

427. A. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 23 lists the Theocritus reference and mentions Lucretius, IV, 1064.

428. Cf. Brooks Otis, "Horace and the Elegists," TAPA, 76 (1945) 177-90. See also E. J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," *Mnemosyne*, rev. IV, 23 (1970) 380 ff. on Lucretius vs. love poetry.

429. Cf. A. Oltramare, p. 63, themes 87-88 on the Cynic view of love as an evil.

430. Fiske (p. 396) thinks that this passage which ". . .makes fun of the 'baby-talk' of the full-grown lover. . ." is a "recollection" of Lucilius, fragment 915 (in Marx; fr. 809 in Krenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 448).

431. Cf. Kiessling and Heinze, p. 257, who note that it is ". . .ethisch umgedeutet von Demetrius (π. ποιημάτων) bei Athen. X 452:

ἀντὶ τοῦ τεθυμωμένον ἄνδρα μὴ ἐριδαίνειν· πῦρ γὰρ ὁ Θυμός, ἡ δ᾽ ἔρις μάχαιρα

(ebenso Jambl. protr. 21, ähnlich Diog. L. VIII, 18). "The explanation given by Diogenes Laertius is

"ἤθελε δ᾽ αὐτῷ τὸ μὲν πῦρ μαχαίρᾳ μὴ σκαλεύειν δυναστῶν ὀργὴν καὶ οἶδουντα Θυμὸν μὴ κινεῖν."

See also A. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 171, who also cites a reference to this same proverb in Jerome, *Adv. Ruf.* 3, 39 (col. 566 Vall.).

432. S. F. Bonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

433. This sketch is in the same tradition as Theophrastus' *desidaimon* or superstitious man, although the Academic philosopher refers to *desidaimonia* (in sketch XVI, 1.1-2, *desidaimonia*) as *deilia pros to daimonion*, rather than as insanity. Theophrastus' *desidaimon*, incidentally, seems to be in worse condition than Stertinus' *libertinus*. Cf. Lejay, p. 379.

434. Superstition or *desidaimonia* is defined, in a fragment found in Stobaeus, ecl. II, 92 W, SVF, III, fr. 408, as *phobos theon e daimonon*. Other types of fear are described in this same list. Antipater of Tarsus is known to have written a treatise *Peri desidaimonias* (SVF, III, 64, p. 257).

435. On the influence of the diatribe style on Horace himself, cf. Walter Wimmel, *Zur Form der Horazischen Diatribensatire* (V. Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, 1962). Wimmel deals especially with satires I, 1 and I, 3, and mentions satire II, 3 only briefly on pages 27-28 (concerning lines 300 ff.) and in one sentence on pages 30, 70 and 72 respectively. His final chapter entitled "Zusammenfassung der allgemeinen Ergebnisse," is valuable as a summary of the elements of the diatribe found in the style of Horace's *sermones*, but again, does not deal specifically with the diatribe in II, 3, but does mention the "Zerstreuung des Gedanken" in lines 307 ff.

For a summary of the diatribal themes (especially the minor ones) found in *Sermones* II, 3, cf. Fiske, p. 389, who makes comparisons with themes found in *Phoinix von Kolophon*, ed. Gustav A. Gerhard (Leipzig, Teubner, 1909).

XUM

On general diatribal themes in Horace, see Hans Herter, "Zur Ersten Satire des Horaz," Rheinisches Museum 94 (1951), 1-42.

436. Fiske cites Lejay, pp. 363-364, in connection with these observations and in connection with the use of Stoic terminology. Lejay notes (p. 364) that "comme dans les autres satires, enfins, les mots et les tours concrets, réalistes, familiers, contrastent avec le ton solennel, la noblesse, l'éclat poétique ou l'elégance d'autres expressions. . . . Cette juxtaposition, qui produit des contrastes piquants, est un des caractères du style d'Horace dans la satire." Concerning the use of the sermo plebeius, obviously an important feature of the diatribal style, cf. J. B. Hofmann, Lateinische Umgangsprache (3rd. ed., 1951); J. Marouzeau, Traité de Stylistique appliquée au Latin (Collection d'Études Latines publiée par la Société des Études Latines, XII, 1935); F. Stolz, J. H. Schmalz, J. B. Hofmann, Lateinische Grammatik, II. Syntax und Stylistic, ed. Anton Szantyr, 1965 (in Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, ed. Ivan von Müller).

437. Fiske (p. 398) remarks concerning II, 3, that "this satire. . ., the most academic of all the Horatian satires, deserves most careful study, as an example of the double indebtedness of Horace to the Greek popular philosophic literature, and to the earlier satiric adaptations of the teachings of that literature by Lucilius."

438. C. W. Mendell, "Satire as Popular Philosophy," Classical Philology, XV (1920) 153.

439. The Teubner (1908) edition by O. Plasberg will be the source for all quotations from and references to the Paradoxa Stoicorum. Numbers will refer to paradox and section.

440. Robert Philippson, "M. Tullius Cicero (Philosophische Schriften)," RE, VII A, Col. 1122, cites this passage from Quintilian.

441. Cf. George Kennedy, The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B. C.-A. D. 300 (Princeton, 1972, pp. 61 ff.; 97-100; 241 ff.; and passim; G. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, 1963), pp. 301-303; 330-336; and passim; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Asianismus und Atticismus" (Hermes, XXXV, 1900, 1-52; cf. A. Haury, op. cit., p. 300); E. Norden, op. cit., I, pp. 184 ff.; 209; 218 ff.; 225 ff.; 239; 258 ff., and passim.

442. Cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium (IV, xv. 22) on interrogatio which resembles the method used here by Cicero and must be related to the system which Cicero calls inductio.

443. S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation* (Liverpool, 1969), p. 55, writes that "the term *color* had, before Seneca's day, been applied only as a general word for 'cast' or 'tone' of style, and was clearly used to represent the Greek χρῶμα. But in Seneca it takes on the quite different meaning of 'twist of argument,' 'plea,' 'excuse;'. . . .". Cf. Cicero, *de Oratore* III, 25, 96 (ed. K. F. Kumaniecki, Teubner, 1969; cited by Bonner, p. 55), "ornatur igitur oratio genere primum et quasi colore quodam et suco suo; nam ut gravis, ut suavis, ut erudita sit, ut liberalis, ut admirabilis, ut polita, ut sensus, ut dolores habeat quantum opus sit, non est singulorum articulorum: in toto spectantur haec corpore." The *color* of the passage, in the Ciceronian sense is grave and polemic, but, in the later sense, the *color* takes the form of a definite slant against Clodius, attempting to prejudice him (as if that were necessary) in the eyes of the audience by classing him with the famous villain Catiline.

444. Cf. Cicero, *De inventione* I, XLV.84 and *Topica* II, 10 on the process of enumeration; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xxix.40 on *expeditio*, a figure which is not identical with Cicero's process here,but which has a similar purpose.

445. Cf. C. Joachim Classen, *op. cit.*, pp. 84 and 95 on Lucretius' habit of inserting unproven statements into his conclusions.

446. Oltramare (pp. 117-118) feels that this passage reflects the theme (no. 19, p. 47), "*l'exil* n'est pas un mal," but one perhaps should consider that theme as only in the background, since Cicero is trying to prove (facetiously, no doubt) that Clodius is the real exile. This theme (i. e. no. 19) is better seen in section 29 when Cicero insists that Clodius has not harmed him.

447. In *De inventione*, I, XVI.22 (Cf. Lausberg, *op. cit.*, p. 158 who cites this passage), Cicero writes, "benevolentia quattuor ex locis comparatur: ab nostra, ab adversariorum, ab iudicium persona, a causa. Ab nostra, si de nostris factis et officiis sine arrogantia dicemus. . . .".

448. Oltramare, p. 117 mentions only the first of these three in his discussion of *Paradoxon* I; his discussion of this *paradox* is limited to the observation that this theme is included in it.

449. Cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xlix.62) for a definition of the figure *exemplum* as ". . .alicuius facti aut dicti praeteriti cum certi auctoris nomine propositio." Cicero's fondness for such examples is evident in sections 11-13 of *Paradoxon* I, but these

XUM

differ from the *chreia* concerning Bias in their brevity and lack of dialogue. On Cicero's use of *exempla* in his other works, see Michel Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire romaine* (Collection d'Études Latines, série *scientifique*, XXVIII, Paris, 1953), passim.

450. This exordium also is true to Cicero's rule that (*De inventione*, I, xviii.25) "exordium sententiarum et gravitatis plurimum debet habere et omnino omnia quae pertinent ad dignitatem in se continere, propterea quod id optime faciendum est quod oratorem auditori maxime commendat; splendoris et festivitatis et concinnitudinis minimum, propterea quod ex his suspicio quaedam apparationis atque artificiosae diligentiae nascitur, quae maxime orationi fidem, oratori adimit auctoritatem."

451. Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 388; cf. above after footnote 396. To support this statement. Fiske cites Lejay's (op. cit., p. 356) references to Cicero, *de Officiis*, I, 7; *de Finibus*, IV, 4.8, and *Tusculans*, III, 56. The *De finibus* passage (ed. F. Schiche, Teubner) observes that the Stoics ". . .et definierunt plurima et definiendi artes reliquerunt, quodque est definitioni adiunctum, ut res in partes dividatur, id et fit ab illis et quemadmodum fieri oporteat traditur. . . .".

452. This is perhaps an abbreviated form of *transitio* which is defined as (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xxvi.35), "quae cum ostendit breviter quid dictum sit, proponit item brevi quid consequatur. . . .".

453. In Oltramare's general list of themes appear, "il faut fuir le luxes des *habitations*. . ." (theme 35, p. 51), "il faut éviter le luxe du *mobilier*. . ." (theme 37, p. 51), and "il faut *satisfaire notre faim aussi simplement que possible*. . ." (theme 31, p. 50). On wealth and avarice, see p. 47, themes 20-2d; p. 54, theme 46a, Gustav A. Gerhard, *Phoinix von Colophon*, *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Teubner, 1909), pp. 58-62 (who notes the Cynic view and also mentions Theophrastus' avaricious man (*aischrokerdes*) in the *Characteres*, (xxx).

454. The anaphora of *nihil*, isocolon, homoeoteleuton, and the repetition of forms of *habere* are obvious rhetorical devices, used for emphasis. One also should compare Cicero's use of examples in sections 11-13 with the practice of Stertinus (in Horace, *Sermones*, II, iii).

455. See Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica*, II, 20, 1394a.31 ff., for the creation of an enthymeme from a maxim with a reason added to it. The term enthymeme is used here and elsewhere in this study

XUM

strictly to refer to the Aristotelian form (see above at footnotes 403 and 405). For Cicero, according to E. M. Cope, An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric with Analysis, Notes and Appendices (London, 1897), p. 104, the term enthymeme (as explained in Topica, XIII.55) ". . .is confined to one particular kind of argument, ex contrariis conclusa, quae ex contrariis conficiatur . . . .". Cf. F. Solmsen. "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric," Kleine Schriften II (Hildesheim, 1968), pp. 194 ff.

456. On the theory involved see also F. Solmsen, "Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings," Kleine Schriften II (Hildesheim, 1968) pp. 216-228.

457. Cicero himself favors the five-part argument and comments about it as follows (de Inventione, ed. E. Stroebel, I, xxxv.61):

> Nobis autem commodior illa partitio videtur esse quae in quinque partes tributa est, quam omnes ab Aristotele et Theophrasto profecti maxime secuti sunt. Nam quemadmodum illud superius genus argumentandi quod per inductionem sumitur maxime Socrates et Socratici tractarunt, sic hoc quod per ratiocinationem expolitur summe est ab Aristotele atque a Peripateticis et Theophrasto frequentatum, deinde a rhetoribus eis qui elegantissimi atque artificiosissimi putati sunt.

Cicero's example of a five part argument (I, xxxviii.68), which follows his comments quoted above, is not in conditional form nor does it adhere to Aristotelian categorical logic.

458. The contrast between this Paradoxon and the diatribes of Bion, Teles, and especially Horace's Stertinus are obvious if one reads them consecutively. Cicero's work seems dry and academic in comparison to that of the other three, and, further, any humor in the Paradoxon is of a very mild and ironical type, too subtle for the diatribe itself.

459. One should always be aware, of course, of the influence of Hellenistic literature on Ennius and should not discount the possibility that the poet felt some of this diatribal influence at second hand, through his sources. Concerning Ennius and Hellenistic literature, cf. U. Knoche, op. cit., p. 15, Jean Granarolo, D'Ennius à Catulle, Recherches sur les antécédents romains de la "poésie nouvelle." (Collection d'Etudes Anciennes publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé, Paris, 1971), pp. 3 ff. and especially his bibliographical footnotes;

Werner Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter*, *Livius Andronicus*, *Naevius*, *Ennius* (Spudasmata, Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten, XIX, Hildesheim, 1968), pp. 68-74, 83-87 and passim. The present study will not attempt to discuss in detail the effects of Hellenistic literature on Ennius.

460. In order to keep Oltramare's remark in proper perspective one must remember that very few lines of Ennius' *Saturae* survive, and so dialogue may not have been so prominent in the remainder of the work.

On the use of satiric poems by Bion see Lejay, *op. cit.*, p. ix. Concerning Crates and his *paignia*, cf. A. Lesky, *op. cit.*, p. 670; Diogenes Laertius, VI, 85 ff.; Hermann Diels *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta*, Berlin 1901), p. 207 (for Diogenes Laertius, VI, 85-98) and pp. 217-220 for fragments of Crates' work. Ennius' grouping of miscellaneous poems, however, need not be due to Cynic influence and may, rather, reflect the influence of Hellenistic collections. Cf. Michael Coffey, "Die 'Saturae' des Ennius," in *Römische Satire* (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, XV, 1966), p. 417; C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, pp. 34 ff.

461. Concerning the meaning of *saturae* in Ennius, cf. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 ff.; Diomedes, *Ars Grammatica* III, in *Grammatici Latini*, I, ed. H. Keil (Leipzig, 1855; rep. 1961, Hildesheim), pp. 485-486, quoted by van Rooy, p. xii.

462. Fragment 22, in E. H. Warmington, ed., *Remains of Old Latin*, I (Loeb, 1961) p. 390. This edition will be the source of all quotations from Ennius.

One should note that not all *spoudaiogeloion* is good *spoudaiogeloion*, for the tone, if used by less clever or especially indignant Cynics or their Stoic imitators, undoubtedly could become vicious or structly polemical without any true redeeming humor. Thus, if Ennius is referring to the Cynics here in a derogatory fashion (which cannot be proved), then he could be attacking this type of speaker.

On this fragment cf. Oltramare, *op. cit.*, p. 76, note 1, and p. 59, theme 66 (cited by him on p. 761 "*le sage mord' ses amis* par sa franchise, pour leur être utile."

463. See, for example, the famous poem by Semonides on women (fr. 7 in *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, I, ed. E. Diehl, Teubner, 1952) in

XUM

which the poet compared women with various animals, including the ape. Cf. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 323, who quotes Cicero (ad. fam. 5, 10a, 1), "simius, non semissis homo. . .," and Plautus (miles Glor. 989), "πιθήκιον haec est prae illa. . . ." Cf. Plautus, *Rudens*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, 1903), lines 593 ff. on Daemones' dream about an ape, an obvious symbol for the *leno* Labrax.

Oltramare (p. 75) cites Plutarch (*de cupiditate divitiarum*; *Moralia* 525 E-F), which contains numerous comparisons drawn between animals and various human traits (such as the ant or ass and avarice), and connects Plutarch's remarks with the diatribal theme (p. 55, theme 49a), "l'homme doit à la raison sa *supériorité* sur les *animaux*.

464. This reference is given by I. M. Bocheński, *Ancient Formal Logic* (Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Amsterdam, 1951), p. 101, who credits Eubulides with originating the problem. As Bocheński notes, Theophrastus and Chrysippus wrote books concerning the paradox.

465. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 36. Van Rooy argues against L. Deubner ("Die Saturae des Ennius und die Iambi des Kallimachos," Rhein. Mus. 96 (1953) pp. 289 ff.), that Ennius' source cannot be". . .the contest between the laurel tree and the olive tree in the fourth *Iambus* of Callimachus, which was concerned with a literary contest. "Van Rooy is probably correct, but neither should one limit Ennius to the ". . .Hellenistic popular philosophy. . ." for a source, even though influence from that quarter is quite likely.

466. Concerning the importance of Hesiod for the Alexandrians, cf. Alfred Körte, *Hellenistic Poetry*, tr. Jacob Hammer and Moses Hadas (New York, 1929), pp. 109-110, 245-247; A. Lesky, *op. cit.*, pp. 750 ff.; Brook Otis, *Virgil*, *a Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1964, rep. 1966) pp. 11 and 19.

Lesky, p. 102, observes that Hesiod's fable is ". . .the earliest animal fable in European literature. . . .". See also Lesky, p. 154 on fables used by Archilochus and Semonides, and on the use of the device for "social criticism."

467. Lesky, *op. cit.*, p. 155, who cites Wehrli (*op. cit.*), vol. IV, fr. 112; concerning other editions see B. E. Perry, *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* (Haverford, 1936),

XUM

cited by Lesky, pp. 155 and 156. See also Morten Nøjgaard, La Fable Antique I (Copenhagen, 1964), pp. 467-479 on Demetrius and the fable.

468. On versified fables and fables at Alexandria, cf. Fiske, op. cit., p. 167. Van Rooy, p. 35 notes that Callimachus does use a fable in his Iambi (II and IV), but that ". . .whereas in Callimachus the fable is coupled with mockery and invective (so, correctly, Deubner), in Ennius there is no evidence of any satirical or militant character in the employment of fable." If van Rooy eliminates Callimachus as a source on the basis of the lack of mockery in Ennius, one might expect him to eliminate the mocking diatribe as well. It is possible, of course, for a diatribe to employ a fable without using sarcasm within the fable itself (cf. Horace, Serm. II, 3, 314 ff. for an example).

469. Concerning Theon and Hermogenes, cf. G. Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, 1963), p. 270, who notes the conservative nature of Greek and Roman education. See also G. C. Fiske, op. cit., pp. 36-37 on the use of paraphrase by the students of Isocrates and by others, cf. Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, II, 1393a25 ff. on the use of the Aesopic fable in oratory.

A second possible fable may be found in fr. 20 (Warmington) of Ennius. The fragment, which deals with a flute player on the shore may be the beginning of the same fable which is found in Herodotus, I, 141; cf. Knoche, op. cit., p. 17 and Warmington, p. 389, note d.

470. Cf. Menander, Dyscolus (ed. H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford, 1960) with its feasting and the attitude of the curmudgeon Knemon (especially in III and IV). See also Plautus, Menaechmi, I, i. 77 ff. (parasite's speech on food); Miles Gl. III, i.10 ff. on feasting; Stichus, V, iv. Perhaps similar in tone to Ennius' verse are the following lines from Plautus' Rudens (II, vi.508-511, ed. W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, 1903):

Ch. Scelestiorem cenam cenavi tuam
Quam quae Thyestae quondam adposita et Tereost.
La. Perii, animo male fit: contine quaeso caput.
Ch. Pulmoneum edepol nimis velim vomitum vomas.

471. Oltramare observes (p. 67) that "plusieurs poètes latins reproduisent des textes littéraires grecs qui, sans avoir été écrits par des philosophes populaires, présentent pourtant de nombreux caractères diatribiques. Je pense spécialement à la 'Comedie

nouvelle' dont l'influence, au début de l'histoire dramatique romaine, est bien connu. La dépendance de ces imitateurs de second degré est tout à fait inconsciente; ceux-là ne font pas partie du mouvement romaine de moralisme littéraire."

472. Oltramare (p. 17) states that "la pensée de Ménandre dépend philosophiquement de la diatribe; le poète développe des thèmes bien connus; ses peintures de parasites et les traits qu'il lance contre les supersititions ont la même origine." In view of the characters described by Theophrastus in his Characteres, however, one should be wary about tracing these themes in Menander back to the Cynic tradition and ignoring the use of similar themes by the Academics. Menander knew of the Cynics, as his ridicule of Crates and Monimus indicates (cf. Lesky, op. cit., p. 646), but he need not have been dependent on them for themes or characters. On Theophrastus and Menander, cf. T. B. L. Webster, "The Comedy of Menander" (in Roman Comedy, ed. T. A. Dorey and D. R. Dudley, Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence, London, 1965), pp. 5 ff.

473. C. A. van Rooy, op. cit., p. 41, observes that Ennius' ". . .realistic account of meddlesome people, drawn straight from the Roman forum, smacks of the irritation expressed by Servius in the Annales. . .". (van Rooy cites fr. 212-214, Warmington, here). On character sketches in Greek and Roman comedy, cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, p. 387, note d. As van Rooy (p. 49, note 56) reminds us, "of the two contemporaries of Ennius, viz. Plautus and Caecilius, the latter was at one time a friend of our poet; and no doubt Ennius' interest in social types was much stimulated by the realism of Roman comedy." Van Rooy, however, feels that Ennius drew his own sketches ". . .from real life. . . .".

474. Festus, who preserves this fragment of Ennius, comments concerning the proverb (490, 7; introduction to fr. 27 of Ennius in Warmington), "'Scirpus' est id quod in palustribus locis nascitur leve et procerum unde tegetes fiunt. Inde proverbium est in eas natum res quae nullius inpedimenti sunt, in scirpo nodum quaerere."

C. A. van Rooy mentions fr. 2 and 27 as ". . .proverbs and moral exhortation. . . ." (p. 32).

475. C. A. van Rooy (op. cit., p. 35) notes that Callimachus' Iambi ". . .was a verse medley not only in contents (including criticism of contemporary morals) but partly also in form, in as much as the poet employed various forms of iambics, including also the trochaic meter, which in the Alexandrian tradition was regarded as falling under the iambic."

XUM

One could argue, of course, that the inclusion of character sketches, a fable, and a lengthy word play within the same collection of poems was the result of the influence of the diatribe which included such varied elements within the same speech. While such a possibility cannot be ruled out, one should note that the *Iambi* of Callimachus seems to have contained just as much variety of content (see footnote 468).

476. Cf. C. A. van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 34 and p. 48, note 30; M. Puelma Piwonka, *op. cit.*, p. 198 (also cited by van Rooy). U. Knoche, *op. cit.*, p. 13 (also cited by van Rooy; Michael Coffey, *op. cit.* (see footnote 460), p. 417. Van Rooy (p. 34) rules out any strong influence on Ennius from the early Italic medleys.

477. On Hellenistic poets and the diatribe, see Johannes Geffcken, *Kynika und Verwandtes* (Heidelberg, 1909), pp. 1-44.

478. On Lucilius' birthplace and rank cf. Jacques Heurgon, "Les éléments italiques dans la satire romaine," in *Römische Satire* (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, 15, 1966), pp. 431-433; Conrad Cichorius, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin, 1908), pp. 1-7 (also cited by Heurgon, p. 431). Heurgon (p. 431) cites Juvenal's (I, 20) reference to Lucilius as ". . .magnus Auruncae alumnus. . .," and summarizes Cicorius' (*op. cit.*, pp. 14 ff.) opinion that Lucilius had a high social position ". . .ce que lui permettait de braver impunément beaucoup de senateurs romains."

479. Cf. Aubrey Gwynn, *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian* (Oxford, 1926) pp. 34 ff.; M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London, 1971), pp. 11-45, especially pp. 30-32.

480. Cf. Oltramare, pp. 91-92, who notes, concerning Lucilius, that (p. 92) "le scepticisme de Carneade s'était imprime pour tourjours dans son esprit." Fiske, *op. cit.*, p. 66; Cicorius, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 ff. (cf. Fiske, p. 135, note 6); Italo Mariotti, *Studi Luciliani* (Studi di Lettere Storia e Filosofia pubblicati dalla Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, XXV, Firenze, 1960), p. 40.

481. Fiske, p. 88, quoted part of Cicero, *De officiis*, I, 135 and observes that ". . .the subject matter of satire can be largely fitted into the discussion on the subject matter of the *sermo* with which 135 begins. . . .".

482. Cf. Fiske, p. 89 and 107-112 who cites Lucilius, Books 9 and 10 for examples of grammatical and rhetorical problems and 26 and 30 for examples of literary criticism. The edition of Lucilius by Werner Krenkel (Leiden, 1970, 2 vols.) will be the source for

XUM

all quotations and references to the poet. The present writer has also consulted Warmington, *op. cit.*, vol. III on Lucilius.

483. On Horace's purposes in writing these lines concerning Lucilius, cf. Fiske, pp. 277 ff.; G. L. Hendrickson, "Horace and Valerius Cato, Part III, The Neoteric Poets and the Latin Purists," CP XII (1917) 329-50; E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 124-128, Walter Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom, Die Nachfolge seines Apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit* (*Hermes*, *Zeitschrift fur Klassische Philologie*, *Einzelschriften*, 16, Wiesbaden, 1960), pp. 148 ff. and especially 151. Van Rooy, *op. cit.*, p. 53, comments that Horace ". . .over-emphasized the dependence of the poet on the 'libertas' of Attic Old Comedy." One should not assume, further, that Horace was excluding all other sources of influence on Lucilius when he stressed the older poet's relationship to Old Comedy.

484. Krenkel, *op. cit.*, gives the Archilochus references in his notes to fr. 720 (pp. 408-409) and fr. 732 (pp. 414-415); Cf. Oltramare, p. 91; Puelma Piwonka, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

485. Cf. Oltramare, p. 92 and *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora*, ed. O. Keller (vol. II, Teubner, 1904, rep. 1967).

486. Concerning this parody, cf. Vincenz Buchheit, "Homerparodie und Literarkritik in Horazens Satiren I 7 and I 9," *Gymnasium*, 75 (1968), 527 note 58. Fiske, p. 153, notes other Homeric situations parodied within these fragments, such as the storm called up by Jupiter (Krenkel, fr. 33) and the decision by him (Krenkel, fr. 55) which are reminiscent of similar scenes in Homer. Cf. J. H. Waszink, "Zur Ersten Satire des Lucilius," *Wiener Studien* LXX (1957) 322-328 (cited also by Krenkel, I, p. 41); cf. Helm, *op. cit.*, pp. 158 ff. on this parody and Lucian.

487. Krenkel, p. 665 lists this parallel. Cf. Buchheit, "Homerparodie . . .," p. 527, who cites as a parallel *Odyssey*, V, 33,

ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπὶ σχεδίης πολυδέσμου πήματα πάσχων. . . .
Concerning other possible parodies of Homer, cf. Fiske, pp. 151-152.

488. Cf. E. J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," *Mnemosyne*, ser. IV, 23 (1970), pp. 388 ff. on possible Lucretian attacks on love poetry.

489. Cf. Buchheit, "Homerparodie. . .," p. 57, note 56 and Puelma Piwonka, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

490. The apparent attack reads as follows (Krenkel, fr. 344-348):

'a' primum est, hinc incipiam, et quae nomina ab hoc sunt
. . . .
'aa' primum longa, <'a'> brevis syllaba: nos tamen
unum
hoc faciemus et uno eodemque ut dicimus pacto
scribemus 'pacem,' 'placide,' 'Iānum;' 'āridum,'
'ācetum,'

Ἆρες Ἄρες Graeci ut faciunt. . . .

491. The information concerning Accius' statue is preserved by the elder Pliny who writes (XXXIV, 19, Krenkel, fr. 747; cf. Warmington, III, p. 273)," notatum ab auctoribus et L. Accium poetam in Camenarum aede maxima forma statuam sibi posuisse, cum brevis admodum fuisset." Cf. Puelma Piwonka, op. cit., p. 142.

492. Cf. Buchheit, "Homerparodie. . .," p. 527, note 56 and Puelma Piwonka, op. cit., p. 128. Lucilius also admired Ennius, however, as a second Homer (cf. Krenkel, fr. 1210; Puelma Piwonka, p. 128).

493. Cf. Fiske, pp. 76, 112, and 146; R. H. Robins, A Short History of Linguistics (Bloomington, Indiana, 1968), pp. 27 ff.; Pohlenz, Die Stoa, I, pp. 47 and 265.

494. On the use of Homeric parodies for literary criticism, cf. Buchheit, "Homerparodie. . .," pp. 522 and 425 ff. See Puelma Piwonka, op. cit., pp. 138 ff. on Lucilius' parodies of Ennius and their implied criticism of the Homeric style; cf. Buchheit, "Homerparodie. . .," p. 527, note 56.

495. These lines are preserved by Lactantius who introduces them with the comment (Krenkel, I, p. 114), "et Iuppiter a precantibus pater vocatur et Saturnus et Ianus et Liber et ceteri deinceps, quod Lucilius in deorum concilio inridet. . . ."

496. On the work of Timon of Philius cf. Lesky, op. cit., pp. 671-672; Charles Witke, Latin Satire, The Structure of Persuasion (Leiden, 1970), pp. 36-38. For fragments of Timon's writings, cf. H. Diels, Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta (Berlin, 1901), pp. 173-206 (cited by Witke, p. 37, note 53). Timon might have been influenced by Menippus (cf. Witke, op. cit., p. 47 on Menippus; Helm, op. cit., p. 40).

497. Fiske, p. 403, thinks that these lines belong to someone ". . .who addresses Penelope, reminding her of other matrons who fell from the path of virtue, Alcmene and Helen, and suggesting that their dazzling beauty was not without its blemishes. . . .".

Alcmene, however, cannot be classed as one who abandoned virtue.

498. A topos concerning the poet and his audience or the mission of the poet (cf. Lucretius, prooemium to book IV, for example) may underlie this statement. Further; the contrast between "sapientes" and the ruler of the dead could reflect such diatribal themes as "le sage est tout puissant. . ." and "le sage a la vraie gloire et la vraie noblesse. . ." (Oltramare, p. 58, themes 58a and 58b), although the sapientes in Lucilius' fragment are not the same as Cynic sages but rather seem to represent his educated readers.

499. Cf. Fiske, pp. 330 ff. The present writer is following Warmington's arrangement of the first satire of Lucilius' sixth book. Warmington (III, pp. 78 ff.) agrees with Fiske, that this satire was the model for Horace, Serm. I, 9. For Krenkel's views which are entirely different, cf. I, pp. 68-69 and his text of the fragments of book VI. Krenkel apparently does not consider significant the parallel (noticed by Fiske, p. 335) between his fragments 238-39 (Warmington, III, 267-268) and lines 77-78 of the Horatian satire which state,

> . . .clamor utrimque undique concursus. sic me servavit Apollo.

500. Cf. Teles, pp. 22.12; 28.2; 30.4; 30.10; 31.4, 34.1; 34.3; 34.11; 42.3; 42.7; 42.13; 45.7; 47.7; 48.13; 51.1; and passim.

501. Cf. Hense, apparatus in Teles, p. 34, where he lists Horace, Sermones I, i.68 ff.; Petronius, 82; Lucian, Timon, 18, dial. Mort. 17, Charon, 15; Maximus of Tyre, 4.4. To these should be compared Lucretius, III, 980-983 where Tantalus is used as an example of the fear of ". . .quem cuique ferat fors." Cf. Traudel Stork, op. cit., pp. 107 ff. and Richard Heinze, ed., T. Lucretius Carus, De rerum natura Buch III (Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern, Leipzig, 1897), pp. 185-186 (cited by Stork, p. 202, note 328.

502. Cf. Puelma Piwonka, p. 62, mentions this fragment as ". . .die Paraklausithyronszenen in den Reisesatiren. . . ."

503. The remark of Bion, quoted above at footnote 121, is not a form of permutatio, but resembles it enough to allow one to assume that Bion, and therefore the diatribe, also made use of the figure.

504. Cf. Horace, Epistulae I, i. 73 ff. (cited by Krenkel, II, p. 577 and I, p. 102; Fiske, p. 428) who writes,

> olim quod volpes aegroto cauta leoni
> respondit, referam: 'quia me vestigia terrent,
> omnia te adversum spectantia, nulla retrorsum.'

505. Cf. Puelma Piwonka, pp. 150 ff. who separates the literary polemic and the fable into different satires; cf. Knoche, op. cit., p. 32 and Warmington, III, p. 361.

506. The arrangement of the fragments, of course, ultimately is a subjective matter, based on the opinion of the scholar who is making an edition of Lucilius. Horace's usage of the fable, however, increases the likelihood that Lucilius included his fable within the framework of another topic.

507. Cf. Warmington, III, p. 182, note a; Fiske, p. 256-7; Krenkel, I, p. 80, on the fragments of this satire. Cf. Oltramare, p. 95, on the diatribal theme involved here.

508. Cf. Fiske, p. 351, footnote 33 and R. Heinze, De Horatio Bionis imitatore, pp. 15 ff. See also E. Fränkel, Horace (Oxford, 1957, rep. 1966) pp. 90 ff. and especially p. 92 on the Peri antarkeias of Teles (cf. Teles, p. 9 ff.). In the Peri antarkeias, p. 9, one finds not a fable but a comparison by Bion which employs animals, and which must be considered a close relative of the animal fable.

Concerning Horace's satire cf. W. Wimmel, Zur Form der horazischen Diatribensatire (Frankfort am Main, 1962), pp. 7 ff.; H. Herter, op. cit., p. 11 (cited by Wimmel, p. 7).

509. Chrysippus himself, of course, could have been influenced by Cynic terminology and metaphors when he wrote the De ira. See above at footnote 300 and following for a discussion of the difficulties involved in tracking down the source of medical parallels. Concerning the interpretation of this satire, cf. Krenkel, I, pp. 85-86. A second example of a metaphorical use of medical terminology seems to be found in the following fragments (Krenkel, fr. 917, 918, 919-920):

> Chironeo et non mortifero adfectus vomicae vulnere
> . . . .
> hoc invenisse unum ad morbum illum, homini vel belissimum . .
> . . . .
>
> . . . . cupiditas
> ex homine, <cupido> cupido et stulto numquam tollitur.

510. For a more detailed treatment of similes and imagery in Lucilius, cf. John R. C. Martyn, "Imagery in Lucilius," in Römische Satire (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock,

XUM

Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 15, 1966), 493-504. The present writer intends to mention only a few representative similes, some of which also are mentioned by Martyn.

511. Martyn, *op. cit.*, p. 496 comments that "although the comparison was a commonplace in Greek literature, Lucilius gives it new treatment in Latin with the reply in character. A similar, lengthy horse-human comparison appears in Cicero (de offic. 1, 90), ascribed by Panaetius to Scipio Aemilianus, and it may well have been a common metaphor in his circle of friends."

512. Cf. Martyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 495-496 concerning the interpretation of these lines and other references to snakes in Lucilius. See also Oltramare, p. 92 and p. 63, themes 85 and 86 for interpretation concerning anger.

513. Cf. Martyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 498-499 on the use of forge images by Lucilius and p. 499 for an interpretation of the simile involving the fowler.

514. Martyn, *op. cit.*, p. 496, comments that "the man-made, homely mouse-traps (muscipulae) set ready to crush the hungry rodent with their heavy weight, make a vivid contrast to the venomous, jet-black field scorpion, with its sinister tail poised to strike if attacked. The *mus* suggests a common target of heavy censure by Lucilius, the *gumia* or glutton, while the scorpion's poisonous thrust reappears in Horace's *aerugo mera* (Sat. 1, 4, 101)."

These lines may refer to Lucilius himself rather than to his opponent (cf. Krenkel, II, p. 575).

515. The simile concerning the butchers' dogs (Krenkel, fr. 1245) probably fits into this same category. Cf. Martyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 494-495 on ". . .the traditional *mordax canis* image. . ." as used by Lucilius.

516. Fiske, p. 332, notes that "in heaping insults upon the bore who seeks to attach himself to his suite Scipio adopts the treatment prescribed by Theophrastus for the garrulus man." Fiske then quotes the following passage from Theophrastus, *Characteres*, Jebb's edition, p. 102, quoted here from Diels, III, 6.20-23 (Oxford, 1909, rep. 1952):

> Παρασείσαντα δὴ δεῖ τοὺς τοιούτους τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαράμενον ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, ὅστις ἀπύρευτος βούλεται εἶναι· ἔργον γὰρ συναρκεῖσθαι τοῖς μήτε σχολὴν μήτε σπουδὴν διαγινώσκουσιν.

Fiske's reconstruction of this satire and assumption that it was influential on Horace (*Serm.*, I, 9) have been attacked by Niall Rudd, in an appendix to his article "Horace's Encounter with the Bore," (Phoenix, 15, 1961), pp. 90-96, with whom Krenkel seems to agree. Rudd's arguments are not entirely convincing to me, although one must admit the hazards involved in working backwards from Horace to Lucilius. See also Puelma Piwonka (cited by Rudd, p. 90, note 40), *op. cit.*, pp. 46, 57, 62, 63 (note 4), 88 (note 1), who accepts Fiske's views.

517. One also should note here that a characterization of the *adolesches* by Bion is preserved in Diogenes Laertius, IV, 50, Cf. Fiske, p. 186, who mentions this fact.

518. Clyde Murley, "Lucretius and the History of Satire" (TAPA, 70, 1939), p. 382 compares these lines with Lucretius, II, 55-58. Cf. Krenkel, I, p. 297 and above at footnote 433 on Horace, *Serm.* II, 3.

519. Of special importance is Oltramare's theme 93 (p. 65), "*les temples et les objets du culte ne méritent aucun respect particulier*. . .," which he derives from Lucian, *Demonax* 27.

520. Cf. Oltramare's theme 94 (p. 65), "toute *croyance aux oracles et aux devins* est ridicule. . .," which he derives from Diogenes of Sinope in Diogenes Laertius, VI, 24.

521. Cf. Krenkel, I, p. 77, who gives "Aberglauben" as the theme of this satire and speaks of "Scharlatane." If the Syrophoenician could be assumed to be some type of charlatan,or if he can be assumed to be lending money to superstitious people, then he might have a place in the satire removed from a representation of avarice.

Fragments such as (Krenkel, fr. 486-487),

> in numero quorum nunc primus Trebellius multost
> Lucius; nam arcessit febris, senium, vomitum, pus,

and (Krenkel, fr. 506-507),

> quae gallam bibere ac rugas conducere ventris
> farre aceroso, oleis, decumano pane coegit,

are open to various interpretations and can be placed into a context concerning avarice (as Warmington does, III, pp. 167 ff.) or only superstition (as Krenkel does, I, pp. 294 and 300).

522. Concerning various forms of the epigram, cf. the collection of papers in *L'Epigramme Grecque* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XIV, Genève, 1967) and especially the paper by Giuseppe Giangrande, "Sympotic Literature and Epigram," p. 135 ff. on the poverty motif.

523. Krenkel, II, p. 663, cites as a parallel the remark of the "philosopher" Anacharsis, who said (Diogenes Laertius, I, 105)

"τὴν ἀγορὰν ὡρισμένον. . .τόπον εἰς τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀπατᾶν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν."

524. Cf. Schmidt, Rostock, p. 514 (cited by Krenkel, I, p. 663), who comments on the tendency toward "Spezifizierung" found in Roman satire but not in the diatribe and who refers to this passage from Lucilius. The poet, in other words, could have taken a general diatribal theme and have adapted it to fit the situation at Rome. Cf. Oltramare, p. 95.

525. As was noted before (see above after footnote 517), Lucilius also might have been familiar with the method of characterization or "notatio" found in rhetorical theory and thus in speeches which were not diatribes.

526. Cf. Italo Mariotti, *op. cit.*, p. 101 who comments, "nel consonantismo si hanno tracce meno numerose della pronuncia popolare e corrente. In un espessione proverbiale, *anus russum ad armillum* (detto di chi ritorna sempre alle sue vecchie abitudini), troviamo l'assimilazione -rs->-ss- frequente nel latino volgare. *Russum* si appoggia ad esempi neviani (com. 89F. *rusus*) e plautini (*Trin.* 182) e sembra ripreso poi da Lucrezio e Virgilio."

527. The following homely proverb appears in fragment 939 (Krenkel), possibly in reference to a courtesan who has found a richer lover (Warmington, III, p. 309, note d):

> quod thynno capto cobium excludunt foras.

Another proverbial remark is (Krenkel, fr. 622)

> mordicus petere aurum e flamma expediat, e caeno cibum.

528. The colloquialisms found in Lucilius have been discussed recently by I. Mariotti, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-125 and need not be treated here. The use of colloquial language could indicate diatribal influence,

but, again, the possible influence of comedy or of the theories of Panaetius concerning the plain style (see above after footnote 480)cannot be discounted.

529. Lactantius (*Inst.* Lib., VI, 5.2), who preserves this fragment comments (Krenkel, attached to fr. 1342-1354), "quaecunque autem in definitionem virtutis solent dicere, paucis versibus colligit et enarrat Lucilius. . . .".

Krenkel (II, p. 711) observes that this ". . .ist das langste Fragment des Lucilius. . ." and that "das Fragment ist rhetorisch kunstvall aufgebaut. . . .". Some of the devices found in fr. 1342-1354 have been discussed by I. Mariotti, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-10 (cf. Krenkel, II, p. 711), who will be cited in the present discussion of the passage by last name and page number only. Many of the figures in the Lucilian text, however are not discussed in detail by Mariotti.

Krenkel (II, p. 711; cf. Mariotti, p. 10) observes that these lines reflect the teaching of Panaetius.

530. Mariotti does not mention this chiasmus, but he does mention another example of the figure (line 1329, *rectum*-line 1330, *inhonestum*) before commenting that "la rima, che que si unisce alla variazione chiastica iniziale, ritorna nella seconda parte in 1334s., tra *hominum morumque malorum* (allitterante e preceduto dall'endiadi *hostem*. . .*atque inimicum*) e *hominum morumque bonorum* (contrapposto al precedente)."

531. Mariotti (p. 9) does not deal with these figures, but only states, "e non vogliamo ancora indugiare su altri elementi di stile: ellissi di *est* (1329, 1331 ss.), antitesi, omoteleuti, omeoptoti."

532. Mariotti (p. 9) comments only that the antithesis of the phases ". . .quae bona. . ." and ". . .quae mala item. . ." is inserted ". . .fra i τρίκωλα contrapposti *rectum*, *utile quid sit*, *honestum* e *quid inutile*, *turpe*, *inhonestum*."

533. Mariotti (p. 9) does not mention the crescendo, but he lists the last three words of the line as a separate tricolon. Other examples of tricolon are cited by him on P. 9 and include lines 1353-1354.

534. Concerning this type of enthymeme, which differs from the Aristotelian, cf. footnote 455, and Cicero's definition which is quoted there.

XUM

535. Arguments such as this one, for the reasons stated, have been classed as rhetorical throughout this study, although no ancient, definition so far available to the present writer has described a rhetorical argument in precisely this fashion.

536. Concerning this line Mariotti comments (p. 87, after he mentions the *epanalepsis*), "vengono descritte con grande vivacità le difficoltà del famoso *iter Siculum*: che il tono sia quello della *Umgangssprache* è dimostrato anche dalla espressione *susque deque* che ricorre in Pl. *Amph.* 886, Cic. ad. *Att.* 14, 6, 1." Colloquial speech obviously does not preclude the use of rhetorical figures.

537. Nicola Terzaghi (*Lucilio*, Studia Philologica 14, Torino, 1934, rep. Rome, 1970; p. 179) comments that "lo spirito del poeta lo ha messo in grado di canzonare Lupo e nello stesso tempo de ridere sui quattro principi essenziali dell'universo applicandoli alla vita di un solo uomo." Cf. Warmington (III, p. 261) who sees this section as ". . .a parody on philosophic discussion. . . .".

Concerning the legal procedure involved, see *XII Tabulae sive Lex XII Tabularum*, ed. E. H. Warmington (in *Remains of Old Latin*, III, Loeb, Cambridge, 1961), Table 1, fr. 1, as follows:

> Si in ius vocat, <ito>. Ni it, antestamino. Igitur em capito.

The theme of the whole satire in which these lines appear is given as "Frauenraub" by Krenkel (I, p. 91) and seems to involve the action and ". . .threats. . .of a lawsuit to come. . ." (Warmington, III, p. 256).

538. Cf. Mariotti, pp. 53 and 54, who stresses the fact that Lucilius himself is not speaking in these lines, and who discusses the Roman poet's attitude towards graecisms (cf. Mariotti, p. 52).

539. For another example, see above at footnote 507.

540. Numerous examples could be cited including Krenkel, fragments 104-106, 113-114, 168-169, 190-191, and 217.

541. For other examples, cf. Krenkel, fragments 286, 514, 539, 605-606, 628, 694, 697-699, and 750-751.

542. See also fragment (Krenkel) 689 in which isocolon appears with homoeopototon, and fragment (Krenkel) 745, where homoeoteleuton and isocolon occur together.

XUM

543. Cf. fragment 323 (Krenkel)

> praesul ut amptruet inde, ut vulgus redamptruet inde,

which also is noteworthy for its use of antistrophe with "inde."

544. See also fragment 446 (Krenkel),

> ut perhibetur iners, ars in quo non erit ulla.

All of the examples of paronomasia cited should be compared with those given in the Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxi.29 ff.

545. See also fragments 291 (Krenkel),

> solem, auram adversam segetem inmutasse satumque,

274 (Krenkel)

> primum fulgit uti caldum e furnacibus ferrum,

and 511-513 (Krenkel),

> hunc milli passum qui vicerit atque duobus
> Campanus sonipes succussor, nullus sequetur
> maiore in spatio ac diversus videbitur ire.

546. See Lausberg, op. cit., I, pp. 312 ff. (sections 616 ff.) concerning geminatio and the various types of figures (such as anadiplosis and epanalepis) which can be grouped under that one heading.

These lines are preserved by Iulius Rufinianus (De figuris sententiarum, 31; quoted by Krenkel, I, p. 108) who describes them as an example of epanalepis. Conduplicatio, as defined by the Rhetorica ad Herennium (IV, xxxviii.38) actually encompasses epanalepsis as well as other forms of geminatio, as the examples given by the unknown author show, and the term epanalepis has been used here only because of its use by Rufinianus.

547. Cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium (V, viii.11 ff.) on the three types of styles and especially the comments (IV, XI.16), "omne genus orationis, et grave et mediocre et adtenuatum, dignitate adficiunt exornationes, de quibus post loquemur; quae si rarae disponentur, distinctam sicuti coloribus, si crebrae conlocabuntur, obliquam reddunt orationem."

548. The quotation concerning Asianism is from George Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton, 1972), p. 61; cf. Ibid., pp. 60 ff. on the Scipionic circle.

Cf. Fiske, pp. 105-107 on ancient judgements concerning Lucilius' style, and the poet himself as *doctus*, *urbanus*, *politus*, *eruditus*, *elegans*, and *facetus*. Fiske observes that (p. 107) ". . .a comparison of the *de officiis* 2, 48, the *de officiis* 1, 132, the *de oratore* 3, 177, and the *orator* 64 shows that *comitas*, *adfabilitas sermonis*, *mollitudo*, are characteristics of the plain style, the style suited to conversation, to the serious philosophic dialogue, to the half-humorous, half-serious dialogues of Cynics and Stoics, and so progressively to the Latin satirical *sermones*." Further, according to Fiske, "this was the frank, informal, conversational idiom, the unassuming literary form which Lucilius employed." Fiske does not seem to take into consideration the elaborate figures which have been mentioned in this study, for he does not discuss them in any section dealing with the plain style. One should add to his conclusions, then, the comment that, while Lucilius' style is undoubtedly plain, as is that of the diatribe with its simple language, the frequent ornamentation of it prevents total conformity with the ideal of Panaetius concerning the conversational style and the didactic purposes of rhetoric. Further, because of the fragmentary state of Lucilius work, it is difficult to ascertain his own views. For example, in fragments 182-189 (Krenkel; cf. Fiske, p. 110) the poet ridicules the excessive use of homoeoteleuton, but he often employs the figure himself, although in a more restrained fashion which perhaps implies a Lucilian application of τὸ πρέπον . Cf. Fiske, p. 109 and Krenkel, fragment 76 for the remark, made by Scaevola, but perhaps illustrating Lucilius' own views (Fiske, p. 109).

'Crassum habeo generum, ne rhetoricoterus tu seis.'

549. Fiske, *op. cit.*, passim, of course, has dealt with the possible influences of Panaetius and of the diatribe on Lucilius, but he has not considered the rhetorical elements which have been discussed here, with the exception of a brief reference on page 110.

550. Oltramare bases his themes 36 and 39 on Plutarch and Epictetus respectively. Ample early evidence for use of such topics, however, can be found among the sayings and actions of Diogenes of Sinope, as described by Diogenes Laertius (VI, 20-81), for these themes easily are extensions of views, held by the Cynic. One must note here that Oltramare himself applies none of these themes

XUM

specifically to Lucilius, and that his discussion of other themes in Lucilius is rather brief. References to Oltramare's themes in this section concerning Lucilius, therefore, do not imply that Oltramare himself applied the themes; themes that are applied by him to Lucilius, or to other authors, are, and have been indicated, by a separate reference to the page of his work on which such an application occurred.

551. Cf. Oltramare, p. 95, who mentions this theme in connection with Lucilius and who also refers to fragment 1244 (Krenkel), which has been quoted above.

552. Cf. Oltramare, p. 95, who comments on this passage. Fiske, p. 235, sees in this fragment "the concept of superfluous, and from the Cynic's point of view, meaningless external possessions. . . .".

To the Lucilian fragments concerning gluttony should be added the following lines, which are cited by Oltramare (p. 94, note 9), and which are coarse enough to seem to reflect Cynic *parrhesia* (Krenkel, fr. 64-66):

> 'nam quid moetino subrectoque huic opus signo?
> ut lurcaretur lardum et carnaria fartim
> conficeret?. . . .'

See also fragments (Krenkel) 171-172, 174, 335-336, 530, 569-570, 948, 1041-1042 and 1187, all of which are cited by Oltramare, p. 94, footnote 9, as fragments dealing with gluttony or drunkenness.

553. Fiske notes (p. 224) that in the anonymous work on *aischrokerdeia* (ed. G. A. Gerhard in *Phoinix von Colophon*, see above after footnote 523), "in line 46 we have the personal expression of contentment with one's lot, ἀπαρκεῦμαι by which the writer asserts his allegiance to the principle of the self-sufficiency αὐτάρκεια of the sage."

554. Concerning the diatribe's use of the theme of envy, cf. Ernst Milobenski, *Der Neid in der Griechischen Philosophie* (*Klassisch-Philologische Studien*, 29, Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. 116 ff. and especially pp. 117-118 on Teles.

555. Fiske, p. 225, in his discussion of Horace, *Sermones* I, i, describes *autarcheia* as ". . .the product of deliberate acquiescence 'with things as they are'. . . .".

XUM

The main themes evident in these Lucilian lines this that which Oltramare (theme 44, p. 53) describes as "il faut *être preparé à tout événement,*". . .basing his description on Diogenes Laertius, VI, 63, where Diogenes of Sinope,

"ἐρωτηθεὶς τί αὐτῷ περιγέγονεν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας, ἔφη 'εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο, τὸ γοῦν πρὸς πᾶσαν τύχην παρεσκευάσθαι.'"

556. Oltramare (p. 95, footnote 6) observes that these last two lines ". . .contiennent une citation homérique et expriment la vanité de la gloire (th. 15)." Oltramare also mentions fr. 462-63 as an example of a theme concerning the quiet life of the sage (p. 93, footnote 4).

557. Expressing a similar view is the line (Krenkel, fr. 740),

quod si observas hominem, quid pro commodo et regno audeat,
cited by Oltramare, p. 95, footnote 6, without reference to theme 17.

558. These sentiments, of course, are not limited to the Cynics. Cf. Philodemus, *Peri parrhesia* and M. Gigante, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-61; Fiske, p. 116 on *parrhesia* as a trait of ". . .Cynic and Stoic popular philosophers. . .," as well as of the writers of Attic comedy; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, xxxvi.48, on the figure "licentia."

559. One need not assume that Lucilius always writes on the basis of his own experience or on the basis of the experiences of others and that his changing attitudes represent a change of mood, especially since the poet had at his disposal so many Greek works dealing favorably (as in lyric poetry) or unfavorably (as in the diatribe) with pederasty.

Cf. Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1, who notes that Lucilius attacks pederasty but ". . .il chante aussi ses amours contre nature. . . .".

Cf. Puelma Piwonka on "Knabenliebe" at Rome, and in the poetry of the Alexandrians and Roman Neoterics, pp. 248-266 and 270 ff.; concerning Lucilius, see pp. 34-35 and pp. 266 ff.

560. Cf. Puelma Piwonka, pp. 266-267; Cichorius, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-291.

561. See E. Fraenkel, Horace, pp. 78-79 on this theme in Horace; cf. Fiske, pp. 258-260 on Lucilius and Horace, Serm. I, iii.

On the dangers involved in adultery, cf. Kiessling and Heinze, II, p. 31, note to line 40 of Horace, Serm. I, ii, who include the following report from Valerius Maximus VI, i.13.

Sempronius Musca C. Gellium deprehensum in adulterio flagellis cecidit; C. Memmius L. Octavium similiter deprehensum pernis contudit; Carbo Attienus a Vibieno, item Pontius a P. Cerennio deprehensi castrati sunt; Cn. etiam Furium Brocchum qui deprehenderat familiae stuprandum obiecit. quibus irae suae indulsisse fraudi non fuit." On laws concerning adultery, cf. Jerôme Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient Rome (ed. Henry T. Rowell, tr. E. O. Lorimer, New Haven 1940, rep. 1972), pp. 94-95; J. A. Crook, Law and Life of Rome (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life, Ithaca, 1967), pp. 101-102, 106.

Fiske, pp. 258 thinks that lines 877-878 (Krenkel),

cum manicis catulo collarique ut fugitivum
deportem,

are spoken by an enraged husband ". . .who expresses the will or wish to lead off or banish somebody (probably the lover of his wife) like a fugitive slave. . . .". Further, fragments 283-285 (Krenkel; cf. Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1),

hanc ubi vult male habere, ulcisci pro scelere eius,
testam sumit homo Samiam sibi 'anu noceo,' inquit,
praecidit caulem testisque una amputat ambo,

according to Fiske (p. 259) ". . .represent the husband of the guilty woman as castrating himself to take vengeance upon her." If Fiske is correct, perhaps this passage should be used as an illustration of Oltramare's theme 76 (p. 61), "la plupart des hommes sont à peu pres fous. . .!"

562. The use of a scene from comedy does not prevent the assumption that a diatribal theme is being illustrated since, as has been noted before (see above at footnote 424 ff.; cf. Fiske, p. 394), the diatribe often took examples from Attic New Comedy. One cannot ascertain, however, whether Lucilius intended these lines only as a humorous parody or whether he wanted to stress, through ridicule, the moral thought involved, although the later possibility seems very likely and would connect the poet with the practices of the diatribe.

Fiske deals with (p. 272) Lucilius' warnings concerning expensive liasons, and, paraphrasing fragment 881 (Krenkel; 861, Marx) notes that, "even a peccadillo with the harpy-like *libertina* will eat into your good name and property even as a polypus consumes itself. . . .".

563. Concerning prostitutes and prostitution in Rome, cf. Hans Herter, "Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 3 (1960), 70-111.

564. Cf. Fiske, p. 272, who notes concerning these lines, "only in the *fornix* or brothel will you find a love that has objective reality, that is (*solidum*), and therefore free from the illusory stimulus, the which surrounds the *liaisons* with matrons. . . .". Cf. Fiske's reconstruction of the content of Lucilius' satire 3 of book 29 and his attempt to connect it, and the different forms of sexual satisfaction, with the different grades of pleasure described by Epicureans (pp. 271-272).

565. Krenkel (p. 367, note to fr. 634-635) notes that these lines are directed, "gegen Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, der 131 v. Chr. als Zensor gefordert hatte, *ut cogerentur omnes ducere uxores liberorum creandorum causa*. . . .". Cf. Cichorius, op. cit., pp. 133 ff.

566. Warmington's arrangement, which places this fragment directly after fragments 634-635 (Warmington's 644-645) seems more logical in view of the contents.

567. For other attacks on marriage, cf. fragments (Krenkel) 502, 999 ff., 1006-1010 and Oltramare, p. 93, footnote 1.

568. See, for example, Terence, *Adelphi*, I, i.26 ff. and V, iv. 855 ff.; Plautus, *Menaechmi*, I, ii.110 ff. (speech of Menaechmus).

569. Cf. the conclusions to the section on Ennius. Lucilius' case obviously is different since the survival of more of his fragments allows one to find enough diatribal traits to assume influence from that quarter, although influence from Callimachus and other Hellenistic writers also must be considered.

570. This study obviously has attempted to deal only with selected figures of major importance. Cf. Lesky, *op. cit.*, pp. 670-671 on papyrus fragments also related to the diatribal tradition and Geffcken, *op. cit.*, passim, on other writers influenced by the Cynic-Stoic genre.

XUM

CHAPTER III

BOOK III, 830-1094: THE DIATRIBE AGAINST THE FEAR OF DEATH

In no section of the De rerum natura is the influence of the diatribe more apparent than in the concluding section of book III. The themes, arguments and stylistic devices all indicate that Lucretius must have been familiar with the Cynic-Stoic genre and that he probably knew the work of Bion himself, whose importance has been discussed above in Chapter II. In order to explore thoroughly the influence of rhetoric and the diatribe upon this passage, and its relationship to Bion or at least to his style, the following discussion will investigate the rhetorical and diatribal traits found within III, 830-1094 and then draw conclusions concerning the entire diatribe. Further, since the relationship between this passage and consolation literature has been investigated carefully by Traudel Stork in her dissertation Nil Igitur Mors est ad Nos, Der Schlussteil des dritten Lukrezbuchs und sein Verhältnis zur Konsolationsliteratur (Bonn, 1970), the present study will deal with that aspect of the conclusion of the third book only when some relationship between the diatribe and consolation literature must be clarified.

Lucretius begins his diatribe with a statement that is at once the conclusion of his previous arguments (cf. Schrijvers, op. cit., p. 151), the premise of the lines which follow immediately (832-869), and the basic theme of the diatribe, occurring, as Ernout and Robin have observed (II, pp. 123-124) ". . .comme une sorte de refrain dans toute cette fin. . . .". The poet claims (830-831),

> Nil igitur mors est ad nos neque pertinet hilum,
> quandoquidem natura animi mortalis habetur. . .,

and then supports his contention with the following remarks (832-869):

> et velut anteacto nil tempore sensimus aegri,
> ad confligendum venientibus undique Poenis,
> omnia cum belli trepido concussa tumultu
> horrida contremuere sub altis aetheris oris,
> in dubioque fuere utrorum ad regna cadendum
> omnibus humanis esset terraque marique,
> sic, ubi non erimus, cum corporis atque animai
> discidium fuerit quibus e sumus uniter apti,
> scilicet haud nobis quicquam, qui non erimus tum,
> accidere omnino poterit sensumque movere,
> non si terra mari miscebitur et mare caelo.
> et si iam nostro sentit de corpore postquam
> distractast animi natura animaeque potestas,
> nil tamen est ad nos qui comptu coniugioque
> corporis atque animae consistimus uniter apti.
> nec, si materiem nostram collegerit aetas
> post obitum rursumque redegerit ut sita nunc est
> atque iterum nobis fuerint data lumina vitae,
> pertineat quicquam tamen ad nos id quoque factum,
> interrupta semel cum sit repetentia nostri.
> et nunc nil ad nos de nobis attinet, ante
> qui fuimus, <nil> iam de illis nos adficit angor.
> nam cum respicias immensi temporis omne
> praeteritum spatium, tum motus materiai
> multimodis quam sint, facile hoc accredere possis,
> semina saepe in eodem, ut nunc sunt, ordine posta
> haec eadem, quibus e nunc nos sumus, ante fuisse.
> nec memori tamen id quimus reprehendere mente;
> inter enim iectast vitai pausa vageque
> deerrarunt passim motus ab sensibus omnes.
> debet enim, misere si forte aegreque futurumst,
> ipse quoque esse in eo tum tempore, cui male possit
> accidere. id quoniam mors eximit, esseque probet
> illum cui possint incommoda conciliari,
> scire licet nobis nil esse in morte timendum
> nec miserum fieri qui non est posse neque hilum
> differre an nullo fuerit iam tempore natus,
> mortalem vitam mors cum immortalis ademit.

The theme expressed in lines 830-831 is Epicurean, for Lucretius has rendered closely Epicurus' remark that "ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν

XUM

πρὸς ἡμᾶς· τὸ γὰρ διαλυθὲν ἀναισθητεῖ· τὸ δ' ἀναισθητοῦν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς . . . " (*Kuriai Doxai*, II; Usener, p. 71; cf. *Letter to Menocceus*, 124ff.; cf. Bailey, p. 1135; Ernout and Robin, II, p. 124). It is interesting to note that Quintilian (V, XIV. 12) includes the following Latin version of this statement within his discussion of the epicheireme as an example of an argument in which the conclusion ". . .non par intentioni sed vim habens parem. . .":

> Mors nihil ad nos, nam quod est dissolutum,
> sensu caret; quod autem sensu caret, nihil ad nos.[1]

Lucretius also has created a type of rhetorical argument based upon his master's saying, and he incorporates within his argument proofs which are Epicurean in origin and depend upon acceptance of the material that has been presented in the preceding lines of book III. Thus line 830 serves as the proposition, line 831 provides the reason or *ratio*, and then in lines 832-864 the poet presents a series of "proofs," based primarily upon analogy, which attempt to demonstrate the truth of both the *propositio* and *ratio*.[2] The first of these proofs comprises lines 832-842, and informs the listener that just as he felt no effects from the Punic war which occurred before his birth, so he will not be affected by anything that happens

> . . .cum corporis atque animai
> discidium fuerit quibus e sumus uniter apti. . . .

Obviously this is a proof based upon analogy, the standard Epicurean form of reasoning.[3] The poet has employed as the basis for his inference the undeniable fact, established by common sense as much as by perception, that, as he expresses it,

> . . .anteacto nil tempore sensimus aegri,
> ad confligendum venientibus undique Poenis. . . .

From this sign Lucretius infers that just as an event happening before one's birth has no effect upon one, so events after one's death also have no effect.

Various scholars have noticed the correspondences between this Lucretian proof and the comment in the Pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Axiochus* (365d) "ὥς οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς Δράκοντος ἢ Κλεισθένους πολιτείας οὐδέν περὶ σὲ κακὸν ἦν - ἀρχὴν γὰρ οὐκ ἦς, περὶ ὃν ἂν ἦν - οὕτως οὐδὲ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν γενήσεται· σὺ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσῃ περὶ ὃν ἔσται."[4] E. J. Kenney (*Lucretius III*, p. 193), for example, states that Lucretius ". . .uses an Epicurean argument ([Plat.] *Axioch*. 365d) in a Roman setting." One probably should assume that the similarities between the Axiochus and Lucretius are the result of the use of a common Epicurean source, since one cannot be certain of the date of the *Axiochus* and since the correspondence between the two works are of such a commonplace nature that they cannot prove Lucretian dependence upon the *Axiochus*. For example, as Ernout and Robin have observed (II, p. 127), "ce raisonnement par analogie qui de l'état passé déduit l'état futur est fréquent chez les anciens . . . .". Further, the use of well-known historical figures as illustrations is a common practice which can be traced back to the rhetorical schools (cf. Gwynn, *op. cit.*, p. 200; Clarke, *Rhetoric*, p. 16), and, therefore, is a weak basis upon which to build a case for dependence. Lucretius' references to the Punic Wars may be the result of his composition of narrative exercises based upon historical incidents[5] rather than his imitation of a source. At any rate, the poet, in choosing to mention the Punic Wars, obviously thought that the reference would be comprehensible to his audience, even though the events mentioned happened long before their birth, and he, therefore, relied upon a common educational background which included the use of historical examples in compositional exercises. One might assume, further, that, if Lucretius were following the Axiochus, he would have mentioned Roman statesmen, possibly, even Scipio, and would not have included his reference to a historical happening which was traumatic for the Romans. It seems plausible, then, that both Lucretius and the author of the Axiochus used an Epicurean source which employed as a proof an analogy based upon past and future and that the two authors then adapted this source to suit their own purposes and style. One cannot state absolutely, however, that Lucretius did not know or use the Axiochus, but the basic orthodoxy of the poet's arguments, which is not broken by his insertion of diatribal topics that are compatible with Epicureanism, argues for his use of a firmly Epicurean source which he has combined, as will be seen presently, with adaptations of diatribes by Bion or his imitators.[6] That the Axiochus does not possess the necessary orthodoxy to be a major source for Lucretius is indicated by the comments of Joseph Souilhé in the introduction to his edition of the Pseudo-Platonic dialogue (Platon, Oeuvres Completes, XIII, 3, Bude, 1930).

As Souilhé has observed (p. 129), there are sufficient differences between the views expressed in the Axiochus and in the works of Epicurus to indicate that the author of the dialogue imitated Epicurean doctrine, "mais son éclectisme lui joue un mauvais tour et il ne s'aperçoit pas que la tendance platonicienne est inconciliable avec la tendance épicurienne: d'une part, il affirme qu'on u'existe plus après la mort (. . .365e) et il en donne comme preuve la dissolution de l'âme et du corps; d'autre part, il replace la personnalité dans l'âme persistante . . . .".

The exact identity of Lucretius' source, however, is of less importance than the fact that the poet has presented an Epicurean argument and has used an Epicurean method to do so. Further, the use of analogy is not incompatible with rhetorical argumentation, for, as Aristotle already noted, rhetorical arguments are constructed upon "signs and examples", since rhetoric ". . .is not concerned with truth, but only with conjecture of the probable or persuasive. . ." (De Lacy and De Lacy, p. 127; Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, I, 1355a 17 and 1359b, 30-33).[7] One must assume that Lucretius uses analogy because he is an Epicurean, but it is interesting to note that, although that school allegedly disparaged rhetoric, its methodology of reasoning has much in common with rhetorical theory.

Following his first proof by analogy Lucretius proceeds to a comment which is related to the idea that one feels nothing after soul and body have separated. The poet writes (842-846),

> et si eam nostro sentit de corpore postquam
> distractast animi natura animaeque potestas,
> nil tamen est ad nos qui comptu coniugioque
> corporis atque animae consistimus uniter apti.

While the first proof conceivably could be accepted by a non-Epicurean who would be persuaded by the "common sense" nature of the analogy, this second one depends heavily upon acceptance of the concept that sensation cannot exist if soul and body are separated[8] (cf. III, 322-369). The poet is relying, of course, upon the strength of the arguments which he has presented earlier within book III, and, therefore, he does not elaborate on the point which he presents within lines 842-846 and which he connects to lines 830-845 through the repetition of nil est (cf. 830) and corporis. . .uniter (cf. 839), an obviously didactic device. Further, in his claim that one will not be affected even if soul and mind retain sensation after death, since one no longer exists once soul and body have separated, Lucretius not only is reiterating the Epicurean doctrine of the unity of soul and body but also seems to be attempting to forestall the objections of those who still believe that the soul has a life of its own.[9] Perhaps the poet has in mind the imaginary opponent which he uses elsewhere (cf. Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 165), whose objections he must give and then answer, although in this case no actual opponent has been set up.

After this brief proof Lucretius includes a third one which is expanded by a brief elaboration and which attempts to lay to rest another source of fear. The poet claims that even if

> . . .materiam nostram collegerit aetas
> post obitum rursumque redegerit ut sita nunc est,

and life should return,[10] nevertheless such an occurrence would not matter (nec. . .pertineat)

> interrupta semel cum sit repetentia nostri.

In lines 850-851 one sees again the emphasis on the idea that death means dissolution, the destruction of personality and consciousness, and that, therefore, whatever happens to the atoms of one's soul after one dies can be of no concern to one who no longer has anything to do with those atoms. This concept, which is repeated in slightly different forms in 830-831, 838-839, 845-846, and 850-851, is the element which connects all of the proofs and reiterates in a didactic fashion the proposition and reason which the poet wishes to demonstrate. In order to illustrate the aspect of this repeated concept with which he deals in lines 847-851 the poet employs an analogy based upon past and present and relies upon the criterion of "lack of proof to the contrary" (see footnote 3). He brings in the present first in lines 852-853, stating,

> et nunc nil ad nos de nobis attinet, ante
> qui fuimus, <nil> iam de illis nos adficit angor. . .,

and thereby uses the fact that one is not concerned now about any previous existence as a sign that one similarly will feel no concern in the future should those atoms which now compose one's soul reunite at some time after one's death to form a person identical to one's present self. In his next eight lines the poet develops the idea expressed in lines 852-853 by bringing in the past, as he did in 832 ff., and observing that one easily may believe that (857-858)

semina saepe in eodem, ut nunc sunt, ordine posta
haec eadem, quibus e nunc nos sumus, ante fuisse.

Lucretius then reiterates the idea previously expressed in 851, when he explains (859-861)

nec memori tamen id quimus reprehendere mente;
inter enim iectast vitai pausa vageque
deerrarunt passim motus ab sensibus omnes.

Since no one, according to Epicurean doctrine and common experience, actually can recall a former existence, there is no evidence available to contradict Lucretius' remark in 859, and therefore his analogy drawn from past and present must be considered valid by the standards of Epicurus' Canonice (see footnote 3).[11]

At the end of this analogy the poet makes the remark (862-864),

debet enim, misere si forte aegreque futurumst,
ipse quoque esse in eo tum tempore, cui male possit
accidere. . .,

which concludes his third proof but which also expresses an idea that is implicit in each of the three proofs. This comment then acts as a natural transition into the conclusion of the entire argument (864-869), where Lucretius presents what must be considered a summary or conplexio (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, II, xviii. 28) making explicit the points which the poet wants his audience to understand from his argument. Thus, Lucretius stresses the idea of nothingness or the destruction of conciousness which comes with death, when he informs his listeners that (866-869),

scire licet nobis nil esse in morte timendum
nec miserum fieri qui non est posse neque hilum
differre an nullo fuerit iam tempore natus,
mortalem vitam mors cum immortalis ademit.

As the above analysis and summary have indicated, the argument in lines 830-869 has a coherent structure and follows a pattern which may reflect the type of rhetorical argument described by the Rhetorica ad Herennium (see footnote 2 of this chapter). Lucretius' arrangement of his proofs also may reflect his rhetorical training, since the poet certainly has put his most convincing and most carefully illustrated ones first and last, almost burying the one which he admits only "for the sake of argument" (see footnote 10).[12] Further, one must note that this argument obviously has been arranged artistically by the poet with the two analogies supplementing and balancing each other and with connecting threads provided by the frequent repetitions of the idea that nothing after death concerns the individual who has died. There seems to be no justification, then, for Kenney's remarks (Lucretius III, p. 195) that lines 843-61 ". . .form a digression or parenthesis within the paragraph. . ." and that "they follow naturally on what precedes (840 qui non erimus ~ 843-4) and are relevant to the theme mors nil est ad nos; but little attempt is made to facilitate the transition back to the main argument at 862."

One cannot ignore the possibility that the argument which Lucretius uses here is based directly upon an Epicurean source and that both the form of the argument and its contents, with the exception of the references to Roman history, depend upon the arrangement followed by that source. Certainly the premise is a translation of Epicurus and the proofs do employ Epicurean methodology. The fact that Lucretius follows a similar scheme in several arguments within his prooemia might be an argument in favor of the poet's independence of style, although one still cannot be sure that the order of proofs followed by the poet here was not a standard procedure among Epicureans. Further, since Lucretius does not argue always in the same way, sometimes using rhetorical arguments (in some of his _prooemia_)[13] and sometimes using "mixed hypothetical syllogisms in destructive form. . ." (Classen, _op. cit._, p. 84), one might argue that the arguments which resemble rhetorical ones are more representative of his own work than are the syllogisms, or one might argue in favor of a plurality of sources. Obviously such problems cannot be solved conclusively, since Lucretius' primary source or sources have been lost. One can only state that Lucretius could have drawn his basic proofs for this argument from an Epicurean source, and then, on the basis of his rhetorical training, he could have constructed an argument following a rhetorical pattern and have embellished his proofs to make them more convincing and artistic.

Another possible indication of rhetorical influence upon the poet is the fact that lines 830-869 are placed at the end of the arguments expressed in book III and serve to reinforce the points that the soul is mortal (cf. 417 ff.), that body and soul must be united for a man to exist (cf. 344-349), that a man is conscious of nothing once soul and body have been separated (cf. 798-829), that one retains no memory of a former existence (cf. 670 ff.), and that nothing evil can happen to one after death, all of which points, as the lines in parentheses above indicate, Lucretius has mentioned in some form elsewhere in book III. One might assume that just as in the _prooemia_ to his books

Lucretius employed the common devices of the rhetorical exordium, so in lines 830-1094, which form an obviously carefully constructed ending for book III, he has made use of some of the elements of a rhetorical conclusio.[14] The fact that this passage contains a type of summary of the most important points made by the poet, then, would allow one to class it as the enumeratio of the conclusion ". . .per quam colliqimus et commonemus quibus de rebus verba fecerimus, breviter, ut renovetur, non redintegretur oratio. . ." (Rhetorica ad Herennium, II, xxx. 47). Such an assumption does not represent an attempt to make book III fit into the mold of a judicial speech,[15] but rather only indicates the probable effect of rhetorical theory upon literature other than orations, and the adaptation and use of rhetorical devices by authors employing such genres as the didactic poem or the philosophical essay (see chapter II, footnote 166). Thus, just as the author of a philosophical treatise might use an arrangement including an exordium, narratio, divisio, confirmatio, confutatio, and conclusio, or use only some of these, and do so under the influence of the rhetoric in which he was trained, so might Lucretius have used an exordium, confirmatio, confutatio, and conclusio simply because, as a result of his training in rhetorical composition or as the result of his use of a source which followed a similar basic scheme, such an arrangement seemed to be the most natural and was almost a matter of habit. One must not forget, of course, that, even though they may be intended as the enumeratio of the poet's conclusion, lines 830-869 also are transitional, in that they lead from the expository section of book three into the diatribal section in lines 870 ff., and introductory, in that they set the theme for the following section, i.e.,

> Nil igitur mors est ad nos neque pertinet hilum. . .,

and begin to set its tone through the irony which appears in lines 832-842.

Before one proceeds to a discussion of the next group of lines (870-893) in the text under discussion (830-1094), one must note briefly a few other elements appearing within this introductory passage (830-869). Especially striking is the proverb (line 842; cf. Bailey, p. 1136) which concludes the first proof, when the poet writes that once soul and body have separated nothing can happen to a man or cause sensation in him,

> non si terra mari miscebitur et mare caelo.

This remark reminds one of an _adynaton_ or impossibility, a common device in which a poet ". . .pour répresenter un fait ou une action comme impossibles, absurdes ou invraisemblables, les met en rapport avec une ou plusieurs impossibilités naturelles."[16] According to the views of those philosophies which believed in the eventual destruction of the world (cf. Stoics and _ekpyrosis_) and of the Epicureans who believed in the eventual dissolution of the present earth into its atoms, which then could form new worlds, the proverb found in line 842, of course, would not be an _adynaton_ but an eventual reality. Lucretius also does not seem to have intended his remark as an _adynaton_, for he uses the device elsewhere (cf. I, 161-166; III, 5-8; III, 622-623; III, 748-753; III, 784-786; Dutoit, _op. cit._, pp. 62-65) in a negative fashion to indicate a true impossibility, often forming a reductio ad absurdum of a view which he opposes, while in this instance he wishes to indicate a possibility or even an eventual occurrence which, however strong it may be, cannot affect a man who has died.

Apparently the poet inserted the proverbial statement because it was familiar to his audience and therefore would convey Lucretius meaning easily and pointedly. That the proverb was familiar seems to be indicated by Cicero's remark (De finibus, III, 19.64) that "quoniamque illa vox inhumana et sclerata ducitur eoxum, qui negant se recusare quo minus ipsis mortuis terrarum omnium deflagratio consequatur - quod vulgari quodam versu Graeci pronuntiari solent. . . .".[17] The Greek verse to which Cicero refers must have been similar to or identical with the following tragic fragment (Frag. Tr. Gr. adesp. 513; quoted from Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 164):

> ἐμοῦ Θανόντος γαῖα μιχθήτω πυρὶ,
> οὐδὲν μέλει μοι, τἀμὰ γὰρ καλῶς ἔχει.

Since Lucretius obviously knew the proverb, like Cicero he may have known this verse, and he may have intended his statement to be a parody of it. Especially important in the tragic fragment just quoted are the words ouden melei moi, since they express precisely the attitude that the poet wants his listeners to have, that is, that nothing matters to them after death. If any of Lucretius' listeners knew the Greek fragment, he, of course, could supply the ouden melei moi, when he heard the Lucretian line concerning earth, sea, and sky. Since one

XUM

does not know the source of this quotation, however, one can make no accurate judgments concerning the possibility that Lucretius intended his remark to mirror it rather than the simple proverb, "γῇ οὐρανὸν συνάπτειν, καὶ γῇ Θάλασσαν ἀναμιγνύναι: ἐπὶ τῶν σφόδρα ὀργιζομένων ἀμφότερα. . ." (quoted from Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 164). At any rate the sentiment expressed in line 842 is in keeping with the generally ironic tone of lines 832-842, which is augmented by the imitation in line 835,

> horrida contremuere sub altis aetheris oris. . .,

of the remark by Ennius (Annales, 306, Warmington; cited by Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 194),

> Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu.[18]

As Kenney has noted, further, "the vocabulary and phrasing of 833-7. . ." seem to indicate that the poet is ". . .imitating, or even parodying the high epic style. . .," and the probability that these lines are a parody seems to be heightened by the ironic tone just mentioned. The irony, the use of a proverb, and the imitation or parodying of poetry, and especially of well-known poetry, are, of course, common traits of the diatribal style[19] and are strong indications that Lucretius has begun to use that style already in these lines which form the introduction to the more obviously diatribal passages which follow.

After his introductory argument concerning death (830-869) the poet commences the major portion of his diatribe with a passage dealing with men who worry about their manner of burial after death. Lucretius

XUM

informs his audience that (870-875)

> Proinde ubi se videas hominem indignarier ipsum,
> post mortem fore ut aut putescat corpore posto
> aut flammis interfiat malisve ferarum,
> scire licet non sincerum sonere atque subesse
> caecum aliquem cordi stimulum, quamvis neget ipse
> credere se quemquam sibi sensum in morte futurum.

Following this statement which serves as the proposition which he wants to prove, Lucretius supplies a reason or ratio for his views, when he adds (876-878),

> non, ut opinor, enim dat quod promittit et unde,
> nec radicitus e vita se tollit et eicit,
> sed facit esse sui quiddam super inscius ipse.

A rationis confirmatio (879-887) and an ironic exornatio[20] (888-893) then are provided by the following lines:

> vivus enim sibi cum proponit quisque futurum,
> corpus uti volucres lacerent in morte feraeque,
> ipse sui miseret; neque enim se dividit illim
> nec removet satis a proiecto corpore et illum
> se fingit sensuque suo contaminat adstans.
> hinc indignatur se mortalem esse creatum
> nec videt in vera nullum fore morte alium se
> qui possit vivus sibi se lugere peremptum
> stansque iacentem <se> lacerari urive dolere.
> nam si in morte malumst malis morsuque ferarum
> tractari, non invenio qui non sit acerbum
> ignibus impositum calidis torrescere flammis
> aut in melle situm suffocari atque rigere
> frigore, cum summo gelidi cubat aequore saxi,
> urgerive superne obtritum pondere terrae.

As the divisions mentioned above indicate, Lucretius once again has constructed an argument which follows the basic outline of a rhetorical argument and which, as a rhetorical argument must (see footnote 7), relies on probability and observations which an audience can grasp quickly. The poet, further, has not included a conclusion, since he prefers to close his remarks in lines 869-893 with his sarcastic expression of the foolishness of concern for one's burial, an expression which is far more emphatic in its irony than any formal conclusion would be. The present writer cannot agree with Kenney (Lucretius III, p. 199), who observes that "in his evident pleasure in the keen sarcasms with which he rounds off the passage he [i.e., Lucretius] apparently fails to notice that he has passed to discussing a commonplace which, though related, is different from that with which he began. . . .". Lucretius, rather, has returned to his starting point (cf. Bailey, p. 1140) in this *exornatio*, for, just as he began with references to concern for the fate of one's body after death, so he concludes with ridicule of that concern, presented as a *reductio ad absurdum*. One should add here that the fact that the poet has mentioned the cause of a man's preoccupation with the destruction of his body does not mean that he no longer is concerned with the form which that fear takes and with the need to indicate the folly of the manifestation of that fear as well as its cause. Lucretius, therefore, demonstrates the latter and then ridicules the former in order to make sure that his audience understands at least something of the folly involved in the attitude which he illustrates.

The method which Lucretius follows in these lines is, of course, diatribal as well as rhetorical.[21] In lines 870-893 one finds traces of an imaginary opponent whom the poet has set up to represent an opinion which he wishes to refute. Lucretius has created a brief characterismos which depicts the state of mind of the man who pities himself, since

> post mortem fore ut aut putescat corpore posto
> aut flammis interfiat malisve ferarum. . . .

Within this character sketch the poet inserts references to his character's remarks. Line 874, for example, concludes with "quamvis neget ipse credere. . .," while in line 874 Lucretius comments,

> non, ut opinor, enim dat quod promittit et unde. . . .

The neget and the non dat quod promittit, like the ferunt of the third prooemium (42), must be considered the equivalent of the diatribal phesin (cf. Chapter II, at footnote 95 ff. and footnote 95) which was used in that genre, as Kenney (Lucretius III, p. 18) notes, to indicate ". . .an anonymous butt, whose objections, invariably futile, were prefaced merely by. . ." the word phesi. Unlike the diatribal practice, however, the Lucretian usage generally does not create an opponent to raise objections, but rather depicts a person who, as in this instance, illustrates a point of view or a specific folly which the poet wishes to present and then dismiss with ridicule, for the edification of his audience and also, as Kenney has suggested (see footnote 21), ". . .to enlist the emotional sympathies of his readers. . .," who, one may add, must be made to feel somewhat superior to the "fool" whom the poet describes.[22]

Through his character sketch in lines 870-893 Lucretius builds up a tone of spoudaiogeloion, intended to make the listener smile at the follies of the character described but also take seriously the poet's message concerning the cause of those follies. The culmination of the sketch is the "contemptuous enumeration" (Kenney's term; cf. Lucretius III, p. 202) in 888-893 where the poet remarks that

> nam si in morte malumst malis morsuque ferarum
> tractari, non invenio qui non sit acerbum
> ignibus impositum calidis torrescere flammis
> aut in melle situm suffocari atque rigere
> frigore, cum summo gelidi cubat aequore saxi,
> urgerive superne obtritum pondere terrae.

Despite the distasteful nature of the subject, the audience certainly must be moved to smiles or even laughter by Lucretius' vivid listing of equally foolish and unfounded fears. Kenney cites (p. 202) as a parallel to this enumeration Bion's similar listing which reads as follows (Teles, p. 31; cf. Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 169):

> εἰ δὲ μὴ κρυφθείης, ἀλλὰ ἄταφος <ῥιφθείης>, τί τὸ δυσχερές; ἢ τί διαφέρει ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαυθῆναι ἢ ὑπὸ κυνὸς καταβρωθῆναι ἢ ἐπάνω τῆς γῆς ὄντα ὑπὸ κοράκων ἢ κατορυχθέντα ὑπὸ σκωλήκων;

The series of rhetorical questions and the enumeration which goes along with them are typical of Bion's style, appearing, for example, in his prosopopoiia of Penia (Teles, pp. 6-8) where the tone, as in this passage, is both scornful and polemical. Possibly Lucretius' enumeration was influenced by the practices of Bion or his imitators, since its tone of spoudaiogeloion and contempt is certainly diatribal. Lucretius obviously has improved upon Bion, if the passage quoted above is representative of the type of source which the Roman poet used, by representing the imagined discomforts of the corpse which, for instance, may be "suffocated" by honey or become stiff from the cold stone upon which it is lying. Such descriptions of the body's situation add humor and vividness which are almost lacking in Bion's sarcastic enumeration of the alternative fates awaiting one's body.

In addition to the other diatribal traits which have been noted there appear two imitations of Roman tragedy which may reflect the diatribe's habit of quoting or parodying poetry. Lucretius writes in lines 873-874, for example,

> scire licet non sincerum sonere atque subesse
> caecum aliquem cordi stimulum. . .,

probably imitating the following line from Ennius' tragedy Andromache (Warmington, I, fr. 112):[23]

> nam neque irati neque blandi quicquam sincere
> sonunt.

The excessive alliteration of "s's" employed by Lucretius may be intended to reflect the general style of Ennius, who is well known for his alliterations (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xii. 18), or possibly the Epicurean poet only wants to emphasize his own remarks concerning the man who worries about the fate of his body. Even if the alliteration is not intended as a parody of Ennius, the use of the phrase sincerum sonere probably represents an intentional reminiscence intended to stress the deceit of himself and of others involved in the self-pity of the fearful man, which differs from the deceit practiced by the irati or blandi of Ennius' fragment only in that it partly deludes the practitioner as well as his listeners. A second and more obvious example of imitation occurs in lines 879-881, where the poet observes,

> vivus enim sibi cum proponit quisque futurum,
> corpus uti volucres lacerent in morte feraeque,
> ipse sui miseret;. . . .

When he wrote these lines, Lucretius seems to have had in mind the following lines spoken by the ghost of Deiphilus to his mother Iliona in Pacuvius' Iliona (Warmington, II, fr. 205-210):[24]

> Mater, te appello, tu quae curam somno suspenso levas
> neque te mei miseret, surge et sepeli natum. . .
> . . .priusquam ferae volucresque. . . .
> neu reliquias quaeso meas sieris denudatis ossibus
> per terram sanie delibutas foede divexarier.[25]

The similarities between ipse sui miseret (Lucretius) and te mei miseret (Pacuvius), and between the second line of the Lucretian passage and Pacuvius' ferae volucresque are obvious and provide strong evidence that Lucretius has at least imitated, and probably, in view of the general spoudaiogeloion of the passage, parodied the speech of Deiphilus. Undoubtedly the Epicurean poet could expect his immediate audience of educated Romans to recognize this imitation, especially since the Pacuvian scene involved the appearance of a ghost, generally a memorable occurrence, which, incidentally, was ridiculed later by Cicero (see footnote 25).

In his imitation of Pacuvius,Lucretius has remained close enough to his original to insure recognition of his source, and he seems to have depended upon his audience's knowledge of the tragic scene to give a special emphasis to the views which he is expressing in lines 879-881. The stress on vivus (879), for example, which is placed first in its

XUM

line, takes on new significance when the listener recalls the speech of Deiphilus and notes that, unlike the dead Deiphilus, Lucretius' worried man is concerned while he is still alive. According to Epicurean views, of course, a man can be concerned about his own corpse only while he is alive, since his body and soul are separated and lose consciousness after death. The remarks in lines 881-887 also have an added significance for the listener who has recognized the Pacuvian imitation in lines 879-881. Lucretius here states that the man who worries about his corpse actually has not realized that

> . . .in vera nullum fore morte alium se
> qui possit vivus sibi se lugere peremptum
> stansque iacentem <se> lacerari urive dolere.

The fact that Deiphilus in the tragic scene does precisely what Lucretius says cannot be done, that is, he watches and mourns the desecration of his body, cannot escape the attention of the audience and must clarify for them the thoughts of the fearful man whom the Epicurean poet is portraying. One must note that once again Lucretius has inserted vivus in order to make certain that his listeners understand that his character, unlike the legendary Deiphilus, is alive and imagining things which he never will witness. The basic effect produced by this parody, then, is the creation of a frame of reference for the listener through the use of allusions to a familiar scene in which those same actions that Lucretius' character imagines are depicted. The audience's memory of this scene allows them to grasp quickly and remember the point which the Epicurean poet makes.[26]

The use of a parody in order to reinforce a point or only to hold the audience's attention, of course, is a diatribal trait, and, when taken in connection with the enumeration in lines 888-893, with the characterismos which comprises lines 870-893, with the use of an imaginary opponent, and with the tone of spoudaiogeloion, must prove that lines 870-893 have been composed within the diatribal style. Further, the facts that this parody is concerned with burial and was taken from a Roman tragedy may indicate direct influence from Bion upon the Epicurean poet. Within the same diatribe in which he enumerated the various fates which await a corpse (Teles, 31. 1 ff.; see above after footnote 22), if Teles' arrangement can be trusted, Bion included three quotations from Greek tragedy, each dealing in some way with burial. The first of these was quoted above in chapter II (section B, at footnote 94); the second notes (Teles, p. 30. 10),

> καὶ γῆς φίλης ὄχθοισι κρυφθῆναι καλόν. . .,

and the third (Euripides, Phoenissae, 1451; Teles, p. 31. 4) begs,

> συνάρμοσον δέ μου βλέφαρα τῇ σῇ χερί,
> μῆτερ.

The appeal to a mother, found in this third quotation, obviously bears a resemblance to the appeal of Deiphilus to his mother, found in the Pacuvian fragment which Lucretius parodies. The situation in the quotation in Bion, of course, seems to be a more normal one than that in the scene from the Iliona, especially since the closing of a dear one's eyes was a common motif in consolation literature and apparently a common practice.[27] Since Lucretius may have been influenced in his enumeration in lines 888-893 by the similar enumeration found in Bion, it is not impossible that the Roman poet also was inspired by the diatribe writer's use of this quotation from the Phoenissae to make use of Deiphilus' appeal to his mother as described by Pacuvius. Even if this particular quotation did not influence him, Lucretius must have been influenced by the quotation of tragedy, and of other types of poetry, within this and other diatribes by Bion and his followers. The Roman poet, however, since he is writing in poetry rather than prose, does not take over completely the diatribal method of quotation, but rather, as he did, for example, in his second prooemium (cf. II, 24-28 and Odyssey VII, 100), he may translate and make subtle alternations in Homer, or he may allude to or imitate Greek (cf. I, 6-7) or Latin (cf. III, 873) poetry, or, finally, as in these lines, he may create a parody or imitation intended to augment his surface description. One, of course, cannot prove that Lucretius was influenced by the diatribe in his use of imitations or parodies, but the presence of these in passages which contain other traits of the diatribal style must strengthen the probability, at least, if they do not indeed confirm the fact, that in such passages the poet was influenced by the Cynic-Stoic genre's didactic use of poetic quotations and parodies.

To the stylistic traits which have been mentioned and which connect III, 870-893 to the diatribal tradition must be added those themes within this text which resemble diatribal topics. Lucretius' description of one's unburied corpse, first of all, seems to reflect the

XUM

diatribal topic described by Oltramare (theme 91c, p. 64) as, "il est stupide de craindre de ne pas être enterré. . .," which is found, of course, in the sarcastic enumeration by Bion quoted above (see after footnote 22).[28] Even closer to the Roman poet's topic in these lines, however, is the following anecdote concerning Diogenes of Sinope which Cicero includes in his Tusculan Disputations (I, xliii. 104; cf. Stork, op. cit., pp. 57-58):

> Durior Diogenes et is quidem idem sentiens, sed ut Cynicus asperius, proiici se iussit inhumatum. Tum amici: Volucribusne et feris? Minime vero, inquit, sed bacillum propter me quo abigam ponitote. Qui poteris? illi, non enim senties. Quid igitur mihi ferarum Laniatus oberit nihil sentienti?

The indifference expressed here by Diogenes is the attitude which Lucretius must want his audience to develop and which is lacking in the character type that the Roman poet describes. Lucretius possibly knew of this anecdote or at least of the Cynic attitude, and he may have had its theme in mind when he wrote lines 879-887 parodying Pacuvius and ridiculing the man who is concerned about the mangling of his corpse. Influence from this Cynic theme, indeed, may be the reason for the Roman poet's greater emphasis upon the mangling of the body than upon the other forms of disposition of the corpse, although, as Bailey suggests (p. 1140), "the strongest fear is that of an unnatural treatment of the body. . ." and therefore Lucretius dwells upon that fear as the one most in need of eradication.

There is a strong possibility, further, that the author of the De rerum natura used a source which dealt with the themes of burial and

XUM

mangling and, which, in addition, quoted a passage from tragedy to illustrate that theme. The probability that Bion was Lucretius' source of inspiration has just been discussed above (see after footnote 27), but the facts that Cicero in his Tusculan Disputations I, xliii-xliv also deals with the topics of the mangling of a corpse and of the lack of bodily sensation after death[29] and that he embellishes his discussion with poetic quotations, and especially with the quotation from Pacuvius' Iliona which Lucretius parodies (see footnote 25), seem to indicate that Lucretius and Cicero had a common source, which, in view of the stylistic evidence, must have been a diatribe or a work influenced by a diatribe. Bion might have been this source, since, as was noted above, his quotation representing an appeal to a mother to close the eyes of her dying or dead son could have inspired Lucretius and also Cicero (or Cicero through Lucretius) to use the Pacuvian lines. Further, since Teles has preserved only fragments of Bion, one might advance the theory that the actual Bionean diatribe was longer and dealt in more detail with the various fears concerning nonburial, perhaps even including an anecdote or two.[30] All of this is speculation, of course, but, since Lucretius' treatment of his theme does have much in common with the work of Bion and of Cicero, one must assume that the poet is somehow connected with both, and that he has in common with Cicero either the use of Bion directly or the employment of a source which included elements taken from Bion, from the Cynic tradition upon which Bion himself drew, or from the imitators of the famous diatribe writer. As Ernout and Robin have observed (II, pp. 125-126), however, "le premier livre des *Tusculanes* est imité de Posidonius, dans lequel Cicéron a trouvé des citations du Περὶ πένθους de l'academicien Crantor, contemporain d'Epicure, que peut-être d'ailleurs il connaissart lui-même directement. . . .". Further, as will be mentioned again presently, Cicero also makes use of Chrysippus, citing him as a source for *Tusculans*, I, xlv. 108 (cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, p. 169 for this source). The use of these Stoics does not preclude the possibility that Cicero used Bion as well, but it is probable that the theme of nonburial and even the anecdotes that the Roman writer employs came from his Stoic sources and, perhaps, ultimately from Crantor.[31] Since Crantor and Bion were approximately contemporaries, one may assume that a theme such as nonburial and the mangling of the body might have been a common philosophical *topos* known to both men and that this *topos* and perhaps commonly known anecdotes concerning it could have been used by each. If this were the case, then Lucretius by using Bion and Cicero by using Posidonius, who used Crantor, could have included this same common topic within their own works without actually using the same source or sources. Such a hypothesis is only one explanation, and still does not explain the use of Pacuvius by both Roman authors, although that use could be coincidental or could be the result of Lucretian influence upon Cicero. If one may take later *consolationes* such as Ps.-Plutarch's *Consolatio ad Apollonium* as an example of the genre, of course, then the quotation of poetry must have been a common

XUM

feature of that genre as well as of the diatribe, and Crantor's work, and subsequently Posidonius', could have employed poetic quotations which provided a model for Cicero, who substituted Roman poetry for the Greek. All of these possibilities have been mentioned to indicate the complicated nature of an attempt to track down the source of a theme which belongs to more than one philosophical school and to more than one genre and the need to rely on some test beyond that of thematic correspondence in order to show the relationship between Lucretius and the diatribe.

In addition to the theme concerning the necessity of avoiding concern for one's burial, one also may see within the enumeration of practices employed for the disposition of corpses (III, 888-893) traces of the Cynic fondness for comparing ". . .entre eux les usages des divers peuples."[32] A common diatribal theme, as listed by Oltramare (theme 14a, p. 46), for example, was the observation that "les moeurs des peuples étrangers sont l'indice que des actions condamnées par l'opinion doivent être considérées comme naturelles." The source for this theme is the remark by Diogenes of Sinope (Diogenes Laertius, VI, 73; cited by Oltramare, p. 46) that ". . .τὸ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων κρεῶν ἅψασθαι . . ." is not anosion, ". . .ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἐθῶν . . . ." Bion may have dealt with foreign burial rites in his Peri taphes (Teles, p. 30.1 ff.), but none of the surviving fragments contains any evidence that he discussed topics other than the fear of nonburial or of burial in a foreign land or possibly also the fear of death. Comparisons drawn from foreign customs were not limited to the Cynics, however, for Cicero, in his Tusculan Disputations (I, xlv. 108), mentions burial customs in various foreign countries and then adds, "permulta alia colligit Chrysippus, ut est in omni historia curiosus, sed ita taetra sunt quaedam, ut ea fugiat et reformidat oratio. . ." (cited by Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 169; cf. SVF, III, fr. 751 ff, and Ernout and Robin, II, p. 136). Lucretius' references to the devouring of the body by animals, to cremation, to embalming, and to inhumation (Bailey's terms, p. 1142) may reflect a source which delineated foreign practices (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, p. 137), but the Roman poet's purpose is not the drawing of comparisons between foreign and domestic customs, but rather the depicting of the foolishness of concern for the disposition of one's corpse. It is this emphasis on foolishness which seems to connect Lucretius' list with Bion's (Teles, p. 31.1 ff.), which also ridicules the absurdity of worrying about burial and which mentions cremation and mangling by animals and birds. Possibly the Epicurean poet added to Bion's list his own information concerning embalming in honey, information drawn from a source such as Chrysippus, from common knowledge,[33] or from a now lost section of Bion's Peri taphes. The practice described by the words ". . .cum summo gelidi cubat aequore saxi. . ." could refer to the familiar practice of laying a body in a sarcophagus or, as Bailey thinks (p. 1142), could be connected with the process of embalming. Actually, with the exception of the embalming process, the forms of burial mentioned by Lucretius are common enough that he could have used Bion's method of enumeration and added all of these methods of burial without using another source. At any rate, whatever Lucretius' source or sources may have been, the method involved seems to be diatribal and may be derived from Bion or may, as Vallette thinks (op. cit., p. 536), be related to the Cynic fondness for comparing the customs of different countries.

Lucretius' themes, however, are not connected only with the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, for in his rhetorical argument (870-893) the poet has expressed views which have an Epicurean basis. These views include his reference to the concept of the loss of sensation which occurs with death (875), and the observation that the man who worries about his body after death does not realize that he has nothing to do with that body once he has died, and that he will be unaware of what happens to it (882-887). Further, as Bailey has noted (p. 1140), the fear ". . .that there will be a surviving 'self' which will identify itself with the corpse (881-2) and, as it were, stand by the corpse and watch its sufferings with pity. . ." was a common Epicurean theme, being found in Diogenes of Oenoanda (ed. Chilton, fr. 14) as well as in an Epicurean passage within the Axiochus (365c). The extant remarks of Epicurus do not include this theme of identification, but Diogenes Laertius (X, 118), in his life of Epicurus, observes that the Epicureans think that the wise man ". . .οὐδὲ ταφῆς φροντιεῖν . . .," and Epicurus, in his Letter to Menoeceus makes the following observation (125; Usener, p. 61):

> οὐθὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ζῆν δεινὸν τῷ
> κατειληφότι γνησίως τὸ μηδὲν ὑπάρχειν ἐν τῷ μὴ ζῆν

> δεινόν. ὥστε μάταιος ὁ λέγων δεδιέναι τὸν θάνατον
> οὐχ ὅτι λυπήσει παρών, ἀλλ' ὅτι λυπεῖ μέλλων. ὃ γὰρ
> παρὸν οὐκ ἐνοχλεῖ, προσδοκώμενον κενῶς λυπεῖ.[34]

Lists of various fates which await one's corpse also may have existed among the Epicureans, for, as was noted above in chapter II (see at footnotes 279 and 283) Philodemus in his De Morte mentions the fate of one who dies at sea (XXXII, 28 ff.) and refers to the fact that once sensation is gone, it makes little difference whether ". . . γῆ<ι> κεκρυμμένον ὑπ' εὐ|λῶν καὶ σκωλήκων ἢ κείμενον ἐ|πὶ γῆς ὑπὸ πυρός . . ." (XXXIII, 1ff.; cf. Bailey, p. 1142). This passage is very similar to Bion's enumeration, of course (see above after footnote 22), and may have been derived from the Peri taphes or from another Bionean diatribe. One, therefore, cannot use it as proof that the enumeration found in Lucretius (888-893) is of Epicurean origin, since Lucretius and Philodemus may have had Bion as a common source.

After his rhetorical argument concerning the man who worries about the fate of his own corpse, Lucretius continues his lecture with a paragraph in which the imaginary interlocutor of the diatribe is very much in evidence (894-911; cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 204) as the poet once again stresses the concept of the loss of consciousness which comes with death (cf. Bailey, p. 1143). Lucretius, presenting first the common notion that a man loses "tot praemia vitae" when he dies, employs his imaginary interlocutor (cf. Stork, pp. 77-78), this time in the plural form (aiunt) as in the prooemium to book III (42), and writes (894-903),

> 'Iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta, neque uxor
> optima nec dulces occurrent oscula nati
> praeripere et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent.
> non poteris factis florentibus esse, tuisque
> praesidium. misero misere' aiunt 'omnia ademit
> una dies infesta tibi tot praemia vitae.'
> illud in his rebus non addunt 'nec tibi earum
> iam desiderium rerum super insidet una.'
> quod bene si videant animo dictisque sequantur,
> dissoluant animi magno se angore metuque.

In contrast to his use of an imaginary opponent elsewhere the poet here allows the interlocutor to speak directly, presumably to the corpse, and he thus varies his method of presentation from the straightforward report of a common opinion which he gave in his last paragraph.[35] A second use of the interlocutor appears in lines 904-911 where Lucretius again uses dialogue when he writes,

> 'tu quidem ut es leto sopitus, sic eris aevi
> quod superest cunctis privatu' doloribus aegris.
> at nos horrifico cinefactum te prope busto
> insatiabiliter deflevimus, aeternumque
> nulla dies nobis maerorem e pectore demet.'
> illud ab hoc igitur quaerendum est, quid sit amari
> tanto opere, ad somnum si res redit atque quietem,
> cur quisquam aeterno possit tabescere luctu.

Both of these instances are related to the other usages of the device by the poet in that the views of the opponent are followed immediately by an instructive comment in which Lucretius shows that his interlocutor is in error. The remarks which the Epicurean poet makes in lines 902-903 and in 909-911, further, contain that mixture of didacticism and ridicule which Lucretius has employed elsewhere (II, 47 ff., III, 57 ff., III, 881 ff.) in answering his imaginary opponent (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 206 on the scornful tone of 909-911).

In the assigning of dialogue to his opponent Lucretius reveals his familiarity not only with the diatribal interlocutor but also with the rhetorical figures known as *sermocinatio*, which the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines as ". . .cum alicui personae sermo adtribuitur et is exponitur cum ratione dignitatis. . . .". Lucretius' purpose in using this figure may be more than the desire for variation, for Bailey has noted that (p. 1143) "the mourners' speeches are rhetorical and reminiscent of funeral orations and sepulchral inscriptions. . . .". Perhaps, then, the poet intends for his dialogue passages to be taken as parodies of typical remarks found in *laudationes funebres* or in various types of consolatory literature such as the *epicedion* or the funereal epigram. The remarks concerning the *praemia vitae* which the dead man has lost, for example, easily could be fitted into the *lamentatio* section of an *epicedion* (cf. Esteve-Forriol, *op. cit.*, p. 137), which often included references to the loss of friendship and similar joys and complained that the dead man should have lived longer, a theme certainly related to the enjoyment of the good things in life. Closer to the sentiments of Lucretius' interlocutor, however, is the following epitaph from Alexandria (3rd century B.C.), included by Richmond Lattimore in his *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1962; p. 176):[38]

οὐκέτι δὴ μάτηρ σε, Φιλόξενε, δέξατο χερσὶν
    σὰν ἐρατὰν χρονίως ἀμφιβαλοῦσα δέρην,
οὐδὲ μετ᾽ ἀϊθέων ἀν᾽ ἀγάκλυτον ἤλυθες ἄστυ

γυμνασίου σκιερῶι γηθόσυνος δαπέδωι.
ἀλλά σου ὄστεα πηγὰ πατὴρ Θέτο τεῖδε κομίσσας,
Καῦνος ἐπεὶ μαλερῶι σάρκας ἔδευσε πυρί.

The image of a mother embracing her son presents a much more simple picture than that in Lucretius' rather sentimental scene, and, although an epigram such as this one could have inspired the Roman poet, his treatment, as Rene Waltz (*op. cit*., p. 96) has noted, approaches ". . . presque à la bouffonnerie. . . .". Lucretius sets a tone of pathos through his use of *conduplicatio* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium,* IV, xxviii. 38) with *iam* and then expands upon the simple theme of the dead man's loss of his family, using a form of rhetorical amplification which resembles the figure *congeries*.[39] Thus the poet's interlocutor first mentions that the man's happy home will receive him no longer, and then comments that neither his *uxor optima* nor his *dulces nati* will run to kiss him and ". . .tacita pectus dulcedine tangent." The picture of all of the family running to kiss the head of the household is, of course, very sentimental and is made even more so by the adjectives *optima* and *dulces* and the phrase "*tacita dulcedine*," all of which are carefully emphasized by the poet's use of *transiecto* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium,* IV, xxxii.44; this is a type of hyperbaton) as well as by the "etymological" relationship between *dulces* and *dulcedine*.

The sentamentalism in lines 894-896 becomes more evident when one considers Lucretius' statements in Book V (1015-1018), where, in his description of the rise of civilization, the poet writes of the beginnings of family life, stating,

ignis enim curavit ut alsia corpora frigus
non ita iam possent caeli sub tegmine ferre,
et venus imminuit viris puerique parentum
blanditiis facile ingenium fregere superbum.

Here Lucretius has created a charming picture in only a few words by mentioning the effects of children's "blanditiis" upon their parents who are trying to discipline them. Missing is the excessive stress on dulces found in III, 894-896. Closer to the style and tone of the "sweet" Lucretian passage (III, 894-896) are the following remarks made by Ovid as he leaves Rome and goes into exile (Tristia, I, 3.63-68 and 79-81; ed. S. G. Owen, Oxford, rep. 1963):

'uxor in aeternum vivo mihi viva negatur,
    et damus et fidae dulcia membra domus,
quosque ego dilexi fraterno more sodales,
    o mihi Thesea pectora iuncta fide!
dum Licet, amplectar: numquam fortasse Licebit
    amplius. in Lucro est quae datur hora mihi,'
. . . .
tum vero coniunx umeris abeuntis inhaerens
    miscuit haec Lacrimis tristia verba meis:
'non potes avelli. simul hinc, simul ibimus:' inquit.

The situation in Ovid, of course, is similar to a death-bed scene, even though only exile and not actual death is the topic, and possesses the ingredients of an excessively sentimental scene, although its sincerity and pathos help to offset those ingredients.[40] Unlike the Lucretian passage, further, Ovid's remarks are presented in a simple style which retains its plainness despite such rhetorical devices as the play upon vivo and viva and the apostrophe in line 66.

If one compares it with the poet's remarks in V, 1015-1018, and with Ovid's description of his departure into exile the scene in III, 894-896 must be seen as a rhetorical exaggeration emphasizing the narrow and sentimental view of the interlocutor who does not realize that the dead man no longer is able to care about such things. The exaggeration becomes even clearer, if one adds to the examples of somewhat similar situations cited above the following imitation by Vergil (Georgics, II, 523-524, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford, 1969; cited by Bailey, p. 1143):

> interea dulces pendent circum oscula nati,
> casta pudicitiam servat domus. . . .

Obviously missing is the emphasis on sweetness provided by the reference to tacita dulcedine and the mention of the uxor optima who also comes to greet her husband in the Lucretian passage. In view of greater simplicity of the Greek epitaph, of the Ovidian passage, of the Vergilian imitation, and especially of Lucretius' own reference to the blanditiis of children, one is tempted to assume that the amplification found in III, 894-896 and the emphasis on loss and misery found in III, 897-899 are not due to any emotionalism on the part of the poet, but rather are intended as a parody of the type of expression found in grave inscriptions such as the one quoted above (at footnote 38) or in the lamentatio sections of epicedia which, incidentally, could have influenced Ovid's method of presentation in Tristia, I, 3.

Another possible source of inspiration for the poet, or perhaps a source for his technique, is the rhetorical practice of including a conquestio or ". . .oratio auditorum misericordiam. . ." (Cicero, De inventione, I, lv.106; cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, II, xxxi.50) in

XUM

the concluding section of a forensic speech. One of the *loci communes* used within this section was that in which ". . .disiunctio deploratur ab aliquo, cum diducaris ab eo quicum libentissime vixeris, ut a parente filio, a fratre familiari. . ." (Cicero, *De inventione*, I, lv.109). Further, another common topic of the *conquestio* required the speaker to compare his previous "commodis" with his present "incommodis." Lucretius undoubtedly was familiar with these *topoi* which he probably had practiced as a schoolboy, and he might have used them almost automatically here when he wished to portray the conventional attitude toward separation caused by death. In fact, the remarks made by the interlocutor in 894-899 easily would fit into the *conquestio* of a speech delivered by the prosecution at a murder trial, if one imagines the speaker arousing pathos by addressing the victim and depicting the loss incurred by him (cf. Quintilian, VI, i.li; cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, p. 151, note g). One could assume, then, that Lucretius has parodied a portion of a typical forensic speech, but, in view of the other topics found within this paragraph (cf. 904ff.), it seems more likely that the object of the poet's parody is some type of consolatory literature such as the *epicedion* which obviously has some topics in common with the *conquestio.*[41] Further, as Heinze (*Lucretius III*, p. 170) has noted, the theme appears in Philodemus' *De Morte*, column 25, where the Epicurean writes (quoted here from Heinze), "τὸ καταλείπειν γονεῖς ἢ παῖδας ἢ γαμετὴν ἤ τινας ἄλλους τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, ἐν συμφοραῖς ἐσομένους διὰ τὴν καταστροφὴν ἡμῶν ἢ καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐλλείψοντα , ἔχει μὲν ἀμέλει φυσικώτατον δηγμὸν καὶ δακρύων προέσεις ἐγείρει τῷ νοῦν ἔχοντι μόνον ἢ μάλιστα."

Since Philodemus was influenced by consolatory literature and by the diatribes of Bion (see above after footnote 34), the topic in these lines could have been taken by him from a consolatio, an epicedion, or what is most likely, from a diatribe such as Bion's Peri taphes, since the emphasis of the argument is on the fact that the dead man no longer is able to care about his family or his own affairs, a concept which is compatible with Cynic doctrine (cf. the anecdote concerning Diogenes of Sinope, above after footnote 28). Lucretius's remarks include this same emphasis, for the poet writes in lines 900-904,

> illud in his rebus non addunt 'nec tibi earum
> iam desiderium rerum super insidet una.'
> quod bene si videant animo dictisque sequantur,
> dissoluant animi magno se angore metuque.

It is not impossible that this theme occurred in a Bionean diatribe and that both Lucretius and Philodemus, who often reveal a dependence upon, or at least of knowledge of, Bion's works, took over from that "philosopher" the topic concerning the dead man's loss not only of his family but also of all concern for his loss. Even if Lucretius found his theme in Bion rather than in some consolatory work, however, the apparent parody which he has created seems to be his own, especially since the remakr found in Philodemus seems to resemble the style of Bion more closely than does Lucretius' treatment.[42]

Following his remarks concerning the dead man's loss of desiderium rerum Lucretius deals with another common topic of consolatory literature in a fashion which suggests that, as in lines 894 ff., the poet again is parodying expressions found within the lamentatio sections of an epicedion or an oration or in tomb inscriptions.[43] The grief of the survivors, which forms the subject of lines 904-911, is a theme appearing in the threnos sections of funeral orations, fashioned after Greek rhetorical theory, where it takes the form of the idea that "sorrow is appropriate" (Burgess, op. cit., p. 156) and in the lamentatio and descriptio funeris et sepulcri of epicedia (cf. Esteve-Forriol, pp. 138-139 and 144 ff.). Within the epicedion, for example, may occur descriptions of the manifestations of grief, such as tears, scratching of the cheeks, tearing of the hair, as well as comments dealing with the sorrow felt by children as compared with their elders or by husbands as compared with wives or vice versa, when a spouse has died (Esteve-Forriol, op. cit., pp. 144-145). One also finds Hellenistic epigrams which express the sorrow of the bereaved who continue to weep (cf. Lucretius, 907, "insatiabiliter deflevimus. . .") after the burial of a loved one. For instance, Leonidas of Tarentum writes,[44]

Ἆ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις, δειλὴ δ' ἐγὼ ἡ τὸν ἐν ἥβης
ἀκμῇ καὶ μοῦνον παῖδα πυρωσαμένη,
Ὀκτωκαιδεκέτης ὃς ἀπώλεο, τέκνον· ἐγὼ δὲ
ὀρφάνιον κλαίω γῆρας ὀδυραμένη.
Βαίην εἰς Ἄϊδος σκιερὸν δόμον· οὔτε μοι ἠὼς
ἡδεῖ, οὔτ ἀκτὶς ὠκέος ἠελίου·
Ἆ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις, μεμορημένε, πένθεος εἴης
ἰητήρ, ζωῆς ἔκ με κομισσάμενος.

Similar sentiments appear in Latin tomb inscriptions[45] such as

(Lattimore, *op. cit.*, p. 181; CE 55, 16-17),

> reliqui fletum nata genitori meo
> et antecessi, genita post, leti diem,

or (*Ibid.*, CE 367, 1-2),

> miserabilis hora
> quoi lucem eripuit caroque viro dedit luctum,

or the fuller description (*Ibid.*, p. 182; CE 398, 4-7),

> liquit et orbatos miseros fidosque parentes:
> uberibus pressis nutricem liquit amantem,
> coniunx nutricis infelix ille relictus
> maeret et ad cineres plangit sua pectore palmis.

The idea of "death as sleep" (Kenney's term, *Lucretius III*, p. 207) also is well attested in Greek epigrams and Latin tomb inscriptions. In the *Greek Anthology*, for example, one finds a poem by Diotimus in which he laments (Mackail, *op. cit.*, p. 269, poem XVII; cf. Gow and Page, 1769),

> Αἰαί, Θηρίμαχος δὲ παρὰ δρυῒ τὸν μακρὸν εὕδει
> ὕπνον· ἐκοιμήθη δ᾽ ἐκ πυρὸς οὐρανίου.

The Hellenistic poet Dionysius also writes of the sleep of death, observing (Mackail, *op. cit.*, p. 264, poem V; cf. Gow and Page, 1441),

> Πρηΰτερον γῆράς σε καὶ οὐ κατὰ νοῦσος ἀμαυρὴ
> ἔσβεσεν, εὐνήθης δ᾽ ὕπνον ὀφειλόμενον
> Ἄκρα μεριμνήσας Ἐρατόσθενες· . . . .

Among Latin tomb inscriptions, further, appear lines such as (Lattimore, *op. cit.*, p. 82; CE 481, 3),

> hic iacet aeterno devinctus membra sopore,

and (*Ibid.*, CE 1997, 8),

> hic tumulata silet aeterno munere somni.[46]

Lucretius, therefore, was dealing with two very common themes when he allowed his interlocutor to tell the dead man, ". . .es leto sopitus. . .," and to complain of the aeternum maerorem of the survivors.

Working with these themes the poet has created a parody of their typical expressions through the use of exaggeration. The antithesis between the sleep of the dead and the constant grieving of the survivors, the use of asyndeton in 905, and the transiectio created by the separation of horrifico and busto in 906 and aeternumque and maerorem in 907-908 are indicative of the essentially rhetorical nature of remarks of the interlocutor, but of chief importance within this passage is the hyperbole (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxxii.44) created by the use of aeternumque maerorem and nulla dies, since these are obvious exaggerations. No grief can be eternal since no man is, and one cannot promise that no day will be free of grief, since he cannot see into the future. Further, as Kenney (Lucretius III, p. 206) has observed, Lucretius here ". . .seizes on the conventional promise never to forget the dead person. . .with all the scorn that he habitually brings to bear on a false philosophical position." One senses that scorn in the exaggerations which the poet attributes to his interlocutor and also in Lucretius' reply, in which he comments (909-911),

> illud ab hoc igitur quaerendum est, quid sit amari
> tanto opere, ad somnum si res redit atque quietem,
> cur quisquam aeterno possit tabescere luctu.

The poet sarcastically throws the opponent's words back at him by pointing out the contradiction involved in maintaining "aeterno luctu" for sleep and rest which normally are not considered anything bitter.[47] Further, the indirect question in these lines serves the same purpose as a rhetorical question which is posed ". . .ubi respondendi difficilis est ratio. . ." (Quintilian, IX, ii.8), since the view of the interlocutor is made to seem childishly ridiculous, The use of strong antithesis and hyperbole and the scorn just mentioned, with which the poet replies, all are indications that lines 904-908 are intended to be a parody of the conventional expressions noted above. Additional evidence for parody is provided by the sound of line 907,

> insatiabiliter deflevimus, aeternumque.

Kenney (Lucretius III, p. 206) notes the facts that the line has only three words and one caesura and that it ends with a word composed of four spondees, all characteristics which ". . .combined to make it probably unique in serious Latin poetry. . ." and probably also "grotesque" in its ". . .effect on the Roman ear. . . ." The ponderous nature of line 907, in fact, suggests that the poet ". . .may be deriding the often limping hexameters found on Roman tombstones. . ." (Ibid., p. 207).[48] Even if Lucretius is not parodying a bad metrical style as Kenney suggests, he certainly must be mocking the pomposity or pretentiousness of the notion that grief is eternal and has used a style in 907 which reflects the exaggeration that he is ridiculing.

The sarcastic tone, the possible parody, and the modified rhetorical question suggest that a possible source for the sentiment which Lucretius expresses here is not his Epicurean predecessors but rather is a diatribe by Bion or his imitators.[49] One finds in Teles (p. 59.6ff.; cf. Oltramare, p. 62, theme 79), for example, a passage quoted in chapter II above (see at footnote 132) in which the author discusses the proper attitude of the bereaved, asking "how is it not thoughtless and foolish to sit weeping and grieving and destroying oneself besides when a friend has died?" Teles then adds his advice that in order to seem *philosophos* in the presence of those who are "struck dumb," one must realize that his friend was *thnetos kai anthropos*. Obviously this passage is not Lucretius' model, since it is concerned only with the avoidance of grief and the creation of a state of *apatheia*, but it has been mentioned here to indicate that topics concerning bereavement were not limited to consolatory literature but also appeared within the diatribe. It is not impossible, then, that a Bionean diatribe actually dealt with themes such as those expressed by the Epicurean poet in 904-911, especially since, as has been noted above, Bion in his *Peri taphes* and perhaps elsewhere dealt with themes concerning burial and in connection with these may have discussed the dead man's loss of consciousness and of concern for family and property (cf. *Lucretius III,* 894 ff. and above after footnote 41) and also the foolishness of extravagant grief. Certainly Lucretius' sarcastic remark and his ridiculing of common topics of consolatory literature suggest that the poet's attitude is compatible with the diatribal style and with Bion's famous *spoudaiogeloion.* The Epicurean poet, of course, did not have to have a specific source at hand to inspire him to use the diatribal style, for, since he was familiar with the traits of that genre, he could apply them at will when his topic seemed to warrant their use. Thus, even if no diatribe by Bion or his imitators had ever dealt with the topic of excessive grief, Lucretius still could have composed his own diatribe upon that theme. Even though one cannot prove that the poet had a definite diatribal source for III, 904-911, then, one must admit that the style, and especially the tone, place this passage as well as the preceding ten lines, within the diatribal tradition, rather than within the tradition of the consolatio or the epicedion which certainly would not attempt to comfort the bereaved by jeering at his opinions.

Following his diatribal treatment of grief Lucretius proceeds to his next topic which has its roots in both Epicurean and diatribal literature. The poet employs his interlocutor once again (who, obviously, is not the same one every time, but rather is a device representing common opinions)[50] and writes (912-918),

> Hoc etiam faciunt ubi discubuere tenentque
> pocula saepe homines et inumbrant ora coronis,
> ex animo ut dicant 'brevis hic est fructus homullis;
> iam fuerit neque post umquam revocare licebit.'
> tamquam in morte mali cum primis hoc sit eorum,
> quod sitis exurat miseros atque arida torrat,
> aut aliae cuius desiderium insideat rei.

The use of the interlocutor, who mouths a common platitude,[51] and the sarcasm of the poet's comment about this opinion (916-918) suggest that these lines are written in the diatribal style and that one should look to the Cynic-Stoic genre for the source of the theme. None of the fragments of Bion in Teles, however, deal precisely with the complaint that life is short or with the idea that death is like sleep. The fact that Lucretius depends heavily upon Bion in lines 931-954, which will be discussed presently, may indicate that in lines 912 ff. he also followed a diatribal source, using, perhaps, part of a sermon dealing with autarcheia or with death and combining it with Epicurean views on death.

As has been mentioned above, however, Lucretius did not need to follow a specific diatribe when he employed the diatribal style. One, therefore, need not assume that Bion or his imitators necessarily dealt with the themes which the Epicurean poet discusses in 912-930, for Lucretius once again may have taken over a common scene from literature and ridiculed it in order to expound his Epicurean doctrine (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 208). Within the Greek Anthology, for example, appears the following epigram by Aesclepiades (Mackail, op. cit., p. 289, poem XI; Gow and Page, 884 ff.), which expresses feelings similar to those of Lucretius' interlocutor:

Πίνωμεν Βάκχον ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἀώς·
    ἦ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;
Πίνωμεν γαλερῶς· μετά τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,
    σχέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκτ' ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

The concept of the brevity of life and the need to enjoy oneself while one can is, of course, older than the Hellenistic poems of the Greek Anthology and can be found, for example, in Theognis (1047ff.), in

Attic skolia, and in the Greek lyric poet Alcaeus,[52] as well as in the comic poet Amphis, whose remark concerning the brevity of life is preserved by Athenaeus (336c, cited by Bailey, p. 1147). Further, one finds the theme also in tomb inscriptions such as (CE 245; Lattimore, p. 262),

> Vive laetus quique vivis, vita parvo(m) munus est,
> mox exorta est, sensim vigescit, deinde sensim deficit,

and (CE 2070, 3-4; Lattimore, p. 262),

> discit]e mortales in spem non vivere longam
> uti quod voluit tempore, tempus abet.

While all of these expressions of a common theme are examples of possible sources for the poet's topic, the use of a banquet scene combined with a "philosophical" comment upon the brevity of life seems to reflect most closely the type of activity and thought common in Greek epigrams such as that of Aesclepiades quoted above (cf. Apollonides in Mackail, p. 288, poem VIII). Lucretius possibly intended his interlocutor's remarks to be a parody of statements resembling the last two lines of Aesclepiades' poem, for the use of the diminuative homullis seems to be an intentional exaggeration, indicative, perhaps, of the drunken state of the speaker (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 209, on pocula), who still, however, seems to be able to ennunciate the homoeoteleuton of fuerit and licebit. In his remarks which follow this parody or at least satirical usage of a common theme the Epicurean poet points out the ridiculous nature of the opinions expressed in 912-915, thereby employing the same method which he used in lines 893-911 and utilizing diatribal spoudaiogeloion to demolish his opponent.

XUM

After this parody in which he employs an interlocutor the poet includes an obviously Epicurean explanation in which he employs an analogy to illustrate his point. Lucretius informs his audience that (919-930)

> nec sibi enim quisquam tum se vitamque requirit,
> cum pariter mens et corpus sopita quiescunt.
> nam licet aeternum per nos sic esse soporem,
> nec desiderium nostri nos adficit ullum.
> et tamen haudquaquam nostros tunc illa per artus
> longe ab sensiferis primordia motibus errant,
> cum correptus homo ex somno se colligit ipse.
> multo igitur mortem minus ad nos esse putandumst,
> si minus esse potest quam quod nil esse videmus;
> maior enim turbae disiectus materiai
> consequitur leto nec quisquam expergitus exstat,
> frigida quem semel est vitai pausa secuta.

The connection between these lines and the banquet scene which precedes them is provided by the idea of the lack of a *desiderium rei* (in line 918), which allows the poet to insert his analogy beginning with the remark that when one is asleep "nec sibi. . .se vitamque requirit." The unconsciousness and lack of *desiderium ullum* when a man is sleeping and his *primordia* are not wandering "longe ab sensiferis. . .motibus . . ." then are presented as an illustration of death which is "multo . . .minus ad nos. . .", since it is accompanied by a greater "disectus materiai", and since one does not awake from it. In his comparison of the known experience, sleep, with the unknown experience, death, Lucretius not only has expounded Epicurean doctrine concerning the behavior of the soul in sleep and in death (cf. Bailey, p. 1147 and Lucretius IV, 916 ff.), but he also has created a typically Epicurean argument based upon an analogy drawn between something which can be

XUM

known by sense perception (sleep) and something which cannot be grasped by the senses but which can be known because of its correspondence to something within the sensible world. In other words, taking the condition of a sleeping man as a sign the poet has inferred from that sign the nature of death which represents a greater disruption of the motions of soul atoms than sleep does.[53] One should note here that Lucretius is not claiming that death is sleep, which, of course, would be a position contrary to Epicurean doctrine. He only is using sleep as an easily understood analogy by which the greater, and complete, lack of consciousness that comes with death can be illustrated. The purpose of this carefully drawn analogy is not only illustration, however, for the poet is using it also as a reinforcement of the ideas which he expressed in 909-911 and in 916-918 (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 210 on 919) and especially the notion that ". . .it is absurd to anticipate a sense of loss that one will not in fact feel. . ." (Kenney, Ibid.). In constructing his illustrative analogy, further, Lucretius could have drawn upon consolatory literature, where the idea of the similarity between sleep and death was a commonplace (Kenney, Ibid., citing Cicero, Tusculan Disputations, I, 92), or upon a diatribe of Bion, since the Gnomologicum Vaticanum (ed. Sternbach; fr. 160, p. 67) reports that Bion said that there are two didaskalias of death, the one being the time before one is born (cf. Lucretius, III, 831 ff.), and the other being sleep (cf. Oltramare, p. 48, theme 25b). The inclusion of Epicurean doctrine concerning the disruption of atomic motion, however, seems to indicate that the poet at least combined Epicurean material with a consolatory or diatribal *topos*, if he did not indeed take over an Epicurean argument (which seems very possible).

The use of an analogy based upon a common experience is, of course, compatible with the diatribal style which the poet employs in lines 912-918, although the analogy itself is a rather straightforward explanation which abandons the *spoudaiogeloion* of the preceding lines and therefore actually heightens the sarcasm of 916-918 by demonstrating the "true" state of affairs which the interlocutor is too foolish to realize. Lines 919-930 also differ stylistically from 912-918, for the diatribal section abounds in homoeoteleuton, a favorite figure of the Cynic-Stoic genre. The correspondence between *fuerit* and *licebit* already has been noted above, and to it may be added the *exurat*, *torrat*, and *insideat* of lines 917-918, which conform to the definition of the figure given by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xx.28; see chapter III, footnote 197). Further, in lines 912-913 one finds a prime example of polysyndeton used in connection with verbs which are not similar enough to be classified as examples of homoeoteleuton but which provide the type of simple parallelism which one can find in the style of Bion, a parallelism which also is evident in lines 917-918. This entire passage, from 912-918, then resembles the diatribal style in its use of homoeoteleuton, polysyndeton, and of parallelism with rather simple sentences (see chapter II after footnote 110 and at 312), as well as in its use of an interlocutor, of a parody, and of *spoudaiogeloion*. The analogy which follows (919-930) is developed in what Kenney has called the expository style of Lucretius (cf. Lucretius, III, pp. 23-29)[54] and is not lacking in rhetorical figures, although those devices which it employs are less obvious than the homoeoteleuta of 912-918. Lines 921-922, for example, include an example of homoeoptoton in the correspondence between aeternum soporem and desiderium ullum, as well as an obvious use of chiasmus in the arrangement of these nouns and adjectives. An additional example of chiasmus appears in line 928 in which the nouns turbae and disiectus are framed by the words which qualify them, that is the adjective maior which modifies disiectus and the genitive noun materiai which belongs with turbae. To these figures may be added the adiunctio (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxvii.38) of errant in line 924, the alliteration in 926, and the possible wordplay created by the proximity of homo and somno in line 925. None of these figures is exaggerated, however, but each fits naturally within its line or lines, a fact which strongly suggests that the parallelism and homoeoteleuta are exaggerated intentionally in lines 912-918 in order to augment the parody which Lucretius has created.

Following his analogy comparing sleep and death Lucretius includes a section whose obvious relationship to the works of Bion frequently has been mentioned but not thoroughly analyzed in terms of the diatribal style.[55] In lines 931-977 the Epicurean poet employs the rhetorical devices known as prosopopoiia (or conformatio), which is defined as (Rhetorica ad Herennium IV, liii.66) ". . .cum aliqua quae non adest persona confingitur quasi adsit, aut cum res muta aut informis fit eloquens, et forma ei et oratio adtribuitur. . .," and Licentia (or parrhesia), which is utilized (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxxvi.48) ". . .cum apud eos quos aut vereri aut metuere debemus tamen aliquid pro iure nostro dicimus, quod eos aut quos ii diligunt aliquo in errato vere reprehendere videamur. . . .". The first of these devices appears, of course, in a fragment of Bion preserved in Teles' Peri autarkeias, while the second is a standard feature of the work of Bion and his imitators, as well as of the Cynic predecessors of the diatribe writer.[56] Since Lucretius' prosopopoiia of Natura bears a strong resemblance to Bion's prosopopoiia of Penia, the following discussion will attempt to show the close relationship between the style and content of Lucretius, III, 931-977, and the work of Bion as illustrated by the fragments which are preserved in Teles.

For convenience of discussion Lucretius' prosopopoiia may be divided into two sections, comprising lines 931-951 and 952-977. In the first of these the poet writes as follows:

> Denique si vocem rerum natura repente
> mittat et hoc alicui nostrum sic increpet ipsa
> 'quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quod nimis aegris
> luctibus indulges? quid mortem congemis ac fles?
> nam si grata fuit tibi vita anteacta priorque
> et non omnia pertusum congesta quasi in vas
> commoda perfluxere atque ingrata interiere,
> cur non ut plenus vitae conviva recedis
> aequo animoque capis securam, stulte, quietem?
> sin ea quae fructus cumque es periere profusa
> vitaque in offensast, cur amplius addere quaeris,
> rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne,
> non potius vitae finem facis atque laboris?
> nam tibi praeterea quod machiner inveniamque,
> quod placeat, nil est: eadem sunt omnia semper.

> si tibi non annis corpus iam marcet et artus
> confecti languent, eadem tamen omnia restant,
> omnia si perges vivendo vincere saecla,
> atque etiam potius, si numquam sis moriturus;'
> quid respondemus, nisi iustam intendere litem
> naturam et veram verbis exponere causam?

The similarities between these lines and Bion's prosopopoiia of Penia become evident when one compares the Lucretian passage with the following remarks of Bion (Teles, p. 6.8-8.6; cf. chapter III at footnote 108):

> διὸ καὶ εἰ λάβοι, φησὶν ὁ Βίων, φωνὴν τὰ πράγματα, ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ δύναιτο δικαιολογεῖσθαι, οὐκ ἂν εἴποι, φησίν, [πρῶτον ἡ πενία, ἄνθρωπε, τί μοι μάχῃ;] ὥσπερ οἰκέτης πρὸς τὸν κύριον ἐφ᾽ ἱερὸν καθίσας δικαιολογεῖται 'τί μοι μάχῃ; μή τί σοι κέκλοφα; οὐ πᾶν τὸ προσταττόμενον ὑπὸ σοῦ ποιῶ; οὐ τὴν ἀποφορὰν εὐτάκτως σοι φέρω;' καὶ ἡ Πενία <ἂν> εἴποι πρὸς τὸν ἐγκαλοῦντα τί μοι μάχῃ; μὴ καλοῦ τινος δι᾽ ἐμὲ στερίσκῃ; μὴ σωφροσύνης; μὴ δικαιοσύνης; <μὴ> ἀνδρείας; ἀλλὰ μὴ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεὴς εἶ; ἢ οὐ μεσταὶ μὲν αἱ ὁδοὶ λαχάνων, πλήρεις δὲ αἱ κρῆναι ὕδατος; οὐχ εὐνάς σοι τοσαύτας παρέχω ὁπόση γῆ; καὶ στρωμνὰς φύλλα; ἢ εὐφραίνεσθαι μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν; ἢ οὐχ ὁρᾷς γρᾴδια φυστὴν φαγόντα τερετίζοντα; ἢ οὐκ ὄψον ἀδάπανον καὶ ἀτρύφερον παρασκευάζω σοι τὴν πεῖναν; ἢ οὐχ ὁ πεινῶν ἥδιστα ἐσθίει καὶ ἥκιστα ὄψου δεῖται; καὶ ὁ διψῶν ἥδιστα πίνει καὶ ἥκιστα τὸ μὴ παρὸν ποτὸν ἀναμένει; ἢ πεινᾷ τις πλακοῦντα ἢ διψᾷ Χῖον; ἀλλ᾽ οὐ ταῦτα διὰ τρυφὴν ζητοῦσιν

ἄνθρωποι; ἢ οἰκήσεις οὐ παρέχω σοι προῖκα, τὸν μὲν
χειμῶνα τὰ βαλανεῖα, θέρους δὲ τὰ ἱερά;. . .'
εἰ ταῦτα λέγοι ἡ Πενία, τὶ ἂν ἔχοις ἀντειπεῖν;

The resemblances begin with the first sentences of each of these passages, for Lucretius' first two lines, and possibly his address to "mortalis" in line 933, correspond to Bion's first sentence (cf. Vallette, *op. cit.*, p. 538, footnote 2 and Stork, *op. cit.*, p. 92). Lucretius' *Denique si*, thus, may be a translation of the Greek *dio ei*, while *vocem mittat* corresponds to *laboi phonen*, and if one removes Hense's brackets, then *mortalis* reflects *anthrope*. Although these similarities are impressive and, in view of others which will be indicated presently, seem to point to the direct dependence of the Epicurean poet upon Bion, it is not impossible that the opening lines of both *prosopopoiia* are formulae derived from rhetorical tradition (cf. Bailey, p. 1151). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* for instance, begins one of its examples of *prosopopoiia* with (IV, liii.66), "quodsi nunc haec urbs invictissima vocem mittat, non hoc pacto loquatur: . . ., o cives, . . .," in which the *quodsi, vocem mittat*, and the address to the citizens could be considered parallel to Lucretius' *si*, *vocem mittat*, and *mortalis*. Similarities between Bion and Lucretius are not limited to their opening remarks, however, for Lucretius' concluding question, despite its legal imagery (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius, III*, p. 216 and Stork, p. 94, who also note the correspondence between Lucretius and Bion), corresponds to the concluding question of Bion's *prosopopoiia*

XUM

where the author also intrudes to make his query. The Latin "quid respondemus," thus, resembles the Greek *ti an echois anteipein*, while Lucretius' comment that one would have to say that Natura has presented a *iustam litem* corresponds in its position, and in its hint of the impossibility of disagreement, with Bion's *doko aphonos genesthai*.

After their opening remarks both Bion and Lucretius launch their attacks upon an imaginary opponent by using rhetorical questions (cf. Stork, p. 92), a favorite device of the diatribal style. The topics of the first questions posed by each author are different, but one must see in *Penia's* query, "*ti moi machei*?," a model for the spirit, at least, of Lucretius' question,

> quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quod nimis aegris
> Luctibus indulges?

Further, the theme of dissatisfaction or the inability to be content with what one possesses which underlies *Penia's* questions possibly is reflected in Lucretius, 944-945, where Natura warns,

> nam tibi praeterea quod machiner inveniamque,
> quod placeat, nil est: eadem sunt omnia semper.

A closer thematic and verbal parallel is provided by lines 938-939,

> cur non ut plenus vitae conviva recedis
> aequo animoque capis securam, stulte, quietem?,

which does not correspond to any specific statement in the *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, but does bear a strong resemblance to Bion's remark "οὐχ ὑπομένω, ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ ἐκ συμποσίου ἀπαλλάττομαι οὐθὲν δυσχεραίνων, οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βίου, ὅταν [ἡ] ὥρα ᾖ . . .,"

which is preserved in a fragment of Teles' *Peri autarkeias*.[57] This

XUM

correspondence suggests that Lucretius may have combined the technique of the prosopopoiia which he found in one Bionean diatribe with themes from another diatribe or elsewhere within the same work by that "philosopher." As Bailey has noted (p. 1152; cf. Kenney, Lucretius, III, p. 214), the idea of quitting life as one would leave a banquet is a ". . .quasi-philosophical commonplace," and is attributed to Epicurus as well as to Bion. Cicero in his Tusculan Disputations (V, xli.118; Usener, p. 310, fr. 499; cited by Bailey, p. 1152), for example, makes the following remarks concerning Epicurus' use of the theme:

> Mihi quidem in vita servanda videtur illa lex, quae in Graecorum conviviis optinetur. 'aut bibat' inquit 'aut abeat,' et recte. aut enim fruatur aliquis pariter cum aliis voluptate potandi aut, ne sobrius in violentiam vinulentorum incidat, ante discedat. sic iniurias fortunae, quas ferre nequeas, defugiendo relinquas. Haec eadem quae Epicurus totidem verbis dicit Hieronymus.

One, of course, is faced here with the usual problems encountered when one attempts to locate the specific source for a commonplace. Oltramare (p. 111-112) nevertheless has attempted to pinpoint Lucretius' source, and he argues that "Lucrèce ne peut avoir suivi Epicure sur ce point; si ce philosophe emprunta en effet à la diatribe cette image, ce fut pour défendre le droit au suicide." Further, "nous sommes amené à supposer ici une source sinon directement bionesque, du moins beaucoup plus proche de Bion que les écrits d'Epicure." Since Lucretius seems to have used Bion as a model for the prosopopoiia of Nature and as a source or model elsewhere, however, there seems to be not need to postulate an intermediate source between the Roman poet and the Greek writer. That Bion is a more likely source for the poet than Epicurus in this instance, further, seems to be supported not only by Lucretius' obvious imitation of the prosopopoiia of Penia, but also by the fact that the Epicurean poet does not seem to be referring to suicide in 938-939 but, as Kenney (Lucretius III, p. 214) has observed, ". . .the image is used to recommend cheerful acceptance of inevitable death. . .," just as it also was used by Bion and later by Horace (cf. Ibid. and Murley, p. 383).[58]

Other themes and stylistic traits which connect Lucretius to the works of Bion or to the diatribe as a genre are to be found in lines 931-951. The rhetorical questions which already have been mentioned are, of course, a very important indicator of the diatribal style, and along with those questions in both Lucretius and Bion there appears that polemic tone which frequently occurs in the Cynic-Stoic genre, often in connection with rhetorical questions. Penia, and Natura in imitation of her, go on the offensive as they pour forth such a stream of questions that the foolish men whom they are "attacking" cannot possibly manage to insert an answer, but rather must "stand convicted" of the foolishness which is described by each personification.[59] Also indicative of Lucretius' polemic tone is the use of stulte by Natura in reference to the recipient of her remarks (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 214). The combination of prosopopoiia, rhetorical questions, and a polemic tone, of course, is intentionally dramatic, harking back to the diatribe's emphasis upon maintaining or regaining the attention of an audience. Obvious within these rhetorical questions, further, in

XUM

addition to polemicism, is their exhortative nature which is indicative of the diatribe's function of urging men to practice virtue, as defined by the speaker (cf. Oltramare, op. cit., p. 13 on the exhortative nature of the genre). Natura, like Penia, is not merely castigating the stultus for his ridiculous opinions, but she also is urging him to accept death without weeping or complaining, an approach which mitigates the negativism of pure polemic. In a similar fashion Penia certainly attacks the foolishness of the dissatisfied man, but she also intends for her questions to be instructive in that they show the good things which a man possesses without wealth.

Also indicative of the diatribal style within lines 931-951 is the presence of certain rhetorical figures favored by the genre, some of which also occur in Bion's prosopopoiia. In lines 933-934, for example, Lucretius employs anaphora, alliteration, and homoeoteleuton when Natura asks,

> quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quid nimis aegris
> luctibus indulges? quid mortem congemis ac fles?

Bion utilizes these same figures, although his style of rapid, brief questions varies from the Roman poet's longer ones (cf. Stork, p. 93). One finds in the diatribe writer's first questions, for instance, obvious anaphora with me, homoeoteleuton with machei and steriskei (cf. Lucretius' indulges and fles), as well as with sophrosynes and dikaiosynes, and later with pinei and anamenei (line 10). Alliteration also occurs in the repetition of "s's" in steriskei, sophrosynes, and dikaiosynes. Examples of homoeoptoton and isocolon, other devices favored by the diatribe, appear in the Lucretian lines (935-937)

> nam si grata fuit tibi vita anteacta priorque
> et non omnia pertusum congesta quasi in vas
> commoda perfluxere atque ingrata interiere,

in which *vita anteacta* and *omnia commoda* correspond to form the figure homoeoptoton, while isocolon and homoeoteleuton are combined, with a second homoeoptoton, in line 937. The alliterative sound of "t's" also helps to make these lines memorable. One, of course, finds each of these figures in the *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*, as well as in other diatribal literature. Isocolon, for example, appears in the questions *mē sophrosynes* and *mē dikaiosynes*, in the phrases *e ou mestai*. . . *laxanon* and *plereis*. . .*hydatos* (Teles, p. 7.5) and elsewhere in the passage. Instances of homoeoptoton include the correspondence between *mestai* and *krenai* (Teles, p. 7.5), between *eunas* and *stromnas* (Teles, p. 7.5-6), and between *hedista* and *hekista* (Teles, p. 7.9-10). To all of these figures may be added the *figura etymologica* of *vitae conviva* in Lucretius, 938 (noted by Stork, *op. cit*., p. 350), to which one may compare, as far as the effect upon an audience is concerned, the *paronomasia* inherent in the sound of *hedista* and *hekista* (Teles, p. 718-10).

Other examples of these figures which have been mentioned and of other figures and devices also appear in Lucretius, 931-951, and are worthy of special note. In line 942, for example, one finds what could become a textbook example of the use of isocolon and homoeoteleuton. Lucretius writes,

> Rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne,

XUM

to which one might compare, "Turpiter audes facere, nequiter studes dicere; vivis invidiose, delinquis studiose, loqueris odiose. . .," an example of homoeoteleuton given by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xx.28), which also might serve as an example of isocolon. An additional and slightly similar example of homoeoteleuton, this time combined with homoeoptoton as well as isocolon,[60] appears in the question (950-951),

> quid respondemus, nisi iustam intendere litem
> naturam et veram verbis exponere causam?

To these figures should be added the *coniunctio* (see chapter III, after footnote 198) which is used by the poet in the line (943)

> non potius vitae finem facis atque laboris?,

in which *facis* occupies a medial position similar to that held by the verb in the sentence "Formae dignitas aut morbo deflorescit aut vetustate. . .," an example of *coniunctio* provided by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xxvii.38). Bion's *prosopopoiia* of *Penia* also employs this figure, in the question "ἢ οὐκ ὄψον ἀδάπανον καὶ ἀτρύφερον παρασκευάζω σοι τὴν πεῖναν;" The fact that all of the figures which have been mentioned appear in both authors does not necessarily imply that Lucretius used them in his *prosopopoiia* of *Natura* only because he found them in Bion's personification of *Penia*. One rather should assume that these figures are characteristic not only of Bion's style but also of the diatribal style as a whole, and that Lucretius employed them primarily because he was utilizing the diatribal style, in which enterprise he was influenced by the work of Bion in general and not just by the one *prosopopoiia* which has survived.

To the evidence of diatribal influence provided by the devices and figures which have been mentioned must be added a brief discussion of the topic found in the following six lines which may reflect a diatribal theme (940-945):

> sin ea quae fructus cumque es periere profusa
> vitaque in offensast, cur amplius addere quaeris,
> rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne,
> non potius vitae finem facis atque laboris?
> nam tibi praeterea quod machiner inveniamque,
> quod placeat, nil est: eadem sunt omnia semper.

Clyde Murley, in his "Lucretius and the History of Satire" (p. 383), has noticed the similarity between lines 940-943 and the following fragment of Lucilius (fr. 205-207, Krenkel):

> nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset,
> hoc sat erat; nunc cum hoc non est, qui credimus porro
> divitias ullas animum mi explere potisse?

Both Krenkel and Murley, further, trace Lucilius' question back to Epicurus' statement that (Usener, p. 302, fr. 473), " ᾧ ὀλίγον οὐχ ἱκανόν, ἀλλὰ τούτῳ γε οὐδὲν ἱκανόν." A closer parallel to the Epicurean fragment, however, seems to be provided by the remark (fr. 568, Krenkel),

> denique uti stulto nil sit satis, omnia cum sint,

found in book 19 of Lucilius' satires. Further, this Lucilian line with its reference to the stulto and emphasis upon the impossibility of fulfilling the wishes of such a person seems to be related to the Lucretian lines quoted above, specifically to lines 941-942 and 944-945, and also to Natura's use of stulte in 939, a term which can be assumed to apply also to the man addressed in 940-945.

On the basis of the similarities of thought and form found in Lucilius, fr. 568, Epicurus, fr. 473, and Lucretius, 940-945, one might assume that Epicurus was the common source of both of the Latin writers, although Lucretius certainly could have known either of the Lucilian passages quoted above. One cannot overlook the fact, however, that the idea expressed by Lucilius in fragment 568, as Fiske (op. cit., p. 192) has observed, ". . .is clearly animated by the same Cynic-Stoic doctrine. . ." as is the diatribe Peri autarkeias of Teles, which contains Bionean fragments, and attacks ". . .the vice of discontent with one's lot, μεμψιμοιρία, a state of mind which finds one of its most striking illustrations in the insatiable love of wealth, φιλοπλουτία . . . .". An example of this theme is found in Teles' Peri autarkeias (p. 11.5-6, cited by Fiske, p. 192), when the author states, " ἀλλ'ἡμεῖς οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς παροῦσιν, ὅταν καὶ τρυφῇ πολὺ διδῶμεν, καὶ τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι. . .αί κρίνωμεν καὶ τὸν Θάνατον ἔσχατόν [τι] τῶν κακῶν."[61] The diatribe writer then adds the advice (p. 11.7-10), " ἐὰν δὲ ποιήσῃ καὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς καταφρονοῦντά τινα, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πόνους μὴ διαβεβλημένον, καὶ πρὸς δόξαν καὶ ἀδοξίαν ἴσως ἔχοντα, καὶ τὸν Θάνατον μὴ φοβούμενον, ὅ τι ἄν Θέλῃς ἐξέσται σοι ἀνωδύνῳ ὄντι ποιεῖν." Lucretius' remarks in 941-942 and 943-944 seem to include at least the themes of mempsimoiria and philoploutia found within these Teles fragments and, additionally, in their concern with death seem connected with the idea of death as the eschaton ton kakon, a concept which both Teles or Bion and Lucretius frequently combat. It does not seem to be impossible that the Epicurean poet could have been familiar with these or similar remarks belonging to the diatribal tradition especially since they may have been a part of the same diatribe in which the prosopopoiia of Penia appears.[62] Lucretius, therefore, quite possibly used Bion or his imitators as a source for lines 940-945, perhaps in addition to an Epicurean work expressing the views found in fragment 302 above,[63] or perhaps as his only source.

Now that the relationship between Lucretius, 931-951, and the diatribes of Bion have been explored, one may proceed to an examination of the second part of the prosopopoiia of Natura (952-977), which also owes an obvious debt to the diatribal tradition. In this section the poet once again sets the stage for his personification and then allows Natura to begin her second attack, as the following lines indicate:

> grandior hic vero si iam seniorque queratur
> atque obitum lamentetur miser amplius aequo,
> non merito inclamet magis et voce increpet acri?
> 'aufer abhinc lacrimas, baratre, et compesce querellas.
> omnia perfunctus vitai praemia marces.
> sed quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis,
> imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita
> et nec opinanti mors ad caput adstitit ante
> quam satur ac plenus possis discedere rerum.
> nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia mitte
> aequo animoque agedum †magnis† concede: necessest'
> iure, ut opinor, agat, iure increpet inciletque.
> cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
> semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest;
> nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra.
> materies opus est ut crescant postera saecla;
> quae tamen omnia te vita perfuncta sequentur;
> nec minus ergo ante haec quam tu cecidere, cadentque.
> sic alid ex alio numquam desistet oriri
> vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.
> respice item quam nil ad nos anteacta vetustas
> temporis aeterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante.
> hoc igitur speculum nobis natura futuri
> temporis exponit post mortem denique nostram.

> numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur
> quicquam, non omni somno securius exstat?

The "victim" of the attack this time is, as the poet indicates, the old man who laments his coming death. Using a rhetorical question Lucretius asks indignantly whether Nature would not correctly ". . . inclamet et voce increpet acri. . .," in view of such ridiculous behavior. Lines 955-962 then comprise the second *prosopopoiia* in which the poet abandons the rhetorical questions found in his previous use of the device and, instead, mounts a direct attack with the imperatives which also are used frequently within the diatribal style,[64] and which are combined here with the derogatory *baratre*, corresponding to *stulte* in 939 (see above after footnote 59). One immediately notices, of course, the thematic correspondences between the lines which follow these opening imperatives (956-960) and section of *Natura's* attack on the *mortalis* in her first appearance. Lines 957-958,

> sed quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis,
> imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita,

for example, certainly reflect the *mempsimoiria* and *philoploutia* found in lines 940-943,

> sin ea quae fructus cumque es periere profusa
> vitaque in offensast, cur amplius addere quaeris,
> rursum quod pereat male et ingratum occidat omne.

Further, the idea of going away from life as from a banquet (938) seems to recur in the "satur ac plenus discedere rerum" of line 960. Since these topics, as was indicated above, can be traced to the diatribal tradition, one might assume that Lucretius found the prototype for his attack upon the foolish old man within a representative work of the

Cynic-Stoic genre. Such an assumption seems to be strengthened by the frequent use by Bion of old age as a theme (see chapter II, after footnote 127) and by the connection of old age with the theme of contentment with one's lot in the remark (Teles, p. 10.6-7; cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, p. 180), " καὶ σὺ πρὸς τὰ παρόντα χρῶ. γέρων γέγονας· μὴ ζήτει τὰ τοῦ νέου. . .," which could indicate a source for Lucretius' combination of the theme of dissatisfaction (957-960) with the concept of acting according to one's age, expressed as (961),

> nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia mitte.

Also possibly involved in *Natura's* remarks are more general diatribal themes such as those which Oltramare lists as "il faut *profiter de ce qu'on possède*. . ." (theme 46, p. 54; from Teles, p. 33.2) and "*les avares* ne savent pas profiter de ce qu'ils possèdent. . ." (theme 46a, p. 57; from Teles, p. 35.4). Lucretius' old man certainly has not known how to profit from what he possesses and always has been greedy for "quod abest," as is evident in lines 957-958.

One cannot ignore the fact, however, that there are Epicurean fragments containing themes somewhat similar to those found in *Natura's* attack in 955-962. As Woltjer has noted (*Lucretii Philosophia*, p. 171), for example, Epicurus himself warned, " Γεγόναμεν ἅπαξ, δὶς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι γενέσθαι· δεῖ δὲ τὸν αἰῶνα μηκέτ᾽ εἶναι· σὺ δὲ οὐκ ὢν τῆς αὔριον <κύριος> ἀναβάλλῃ τὸ χαῖρον· ὁ δὲ βίος μελλησμῷ παραπόλλυται καὶ εἷς ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἀσχολούμενος ἀποθνῄσκει."[65] This warning possibly corresponds to

Lucretius' remarks in 957-958 (cf. Bailey, p. 1154) with their emphasis on the old man's scornful attitude toward "praesentia," which caused his life to be *imperfecta* and *ingrata*. In the Epicurean fragment, however, is lacking the theme of *mempsimoiria* and its accompanying greed which seem to be evident in the Lucretian lines (see also Kenney, p. 217). Perhaps the poet has combined an Epicurean sentiment with a diatribal topic, as he seems to have done before (see above after footnote 53). One should note also that the idea of always seeking something beyond what one has is a common topic found outside of Epicurean doctrine and the diatribe. Plautus, for instance, writes in his *Pseudolus* (685),

> Certa amittimus, dum incerta petimus,

while Aesop's fable concerning the dog which, confused by its own image in a stream, dropped the meat which it was carrying and vainly attempted to get the meat carried by the "other" dog, thereby losing something real in the vain pursuit of something *incertum* (cf. Phaedrus, I, 4).[66] The proverbial nature of this theme, however, connects it more closely with the diatribal tradition which frequently used proverbs and fables to convey a message, and therefore should not be considered a reason for excluding the diatribe as a possible source for the Roman poet. Another theme found in this Lucretian passage and in Epicurean literature is that of death coming upon one before one feels ready for it. Philodemus, for instance, in the *De Morte* (XXXVII, 18ff.; cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, p. 180), writes, "τὸ τοίνυν συν|α[ρ]πάζεσθα[ι] Θανάτου προσπίπτον|τ[ο]ς, ὡς ἀπροσ[δο]κήτου τινὸς καὶ π[α]ρα|δόξου συνα[ν]τῶντο[ς], ἡ[μεῖ]ν [μὲ]ν|[οὐχί, γί]νετα[ιδ]ὲ περὶ τοὺς πλείστ[ου]ς|ἀγνοοῦν[τ]ας . . .". To this remark one might add the fragments of Epicurius which state that everyone departs from life just as if *arti gegonos* (*Sent. Vat*., LX; cf. Bailey, p. 1154) and that unmindful of the good that already has happened to him a man *geron temeron gengenetai* (*Sent. Vat*., XIX; cf. Bailey, p. 1154). These themes also may be of a common nature, however, although the good Epicurean must, of course, be ready for death whenever it comes (cf. Metrodorus, cited in Bailey's ed. of Epicurus, p. 112, fr. XLVII; Epicurus, *Sent. Vat*., XLVIII). If one considers these last themes concerning death and the diatribal themes which were mentioned above in connection with 957 ff. and which are lacking in the Epicurean fragments cited above, then, one must conclude that Lucretius has taken over themes which he found in the diatribes of Bion and his imitators and has combined those themes with Epicurean doctrine to create a composite picture of the old man who was never content in life and who is now urged to cease his foolish behavior and die *aequo animo*.[67]

In support of the idea that the diatribe did have an influence upon the themes in lines 952-962 one may cite the various traits generally found within the Cynic-Stoic genre which also make an appearance within this passage. The importance of the *prosopopoiia* within the diatribal tradition already has been mentioned above, and one must assume that Lucretius' usage of a second personification owes its inspiration to the employment of that device by Bion or his imitators. A second strong indicator of diatribal influence is the presence of an imaginary interlocutor, represented by the poet's remarks that (952-954),

grandior hic vero si iam seniorque queratur
atque obitum lamentetur miser amplius aequo,
non merito inclamet magis et voce increpet acri?

Lucretius employs his interlocutor here as, for example, he did in lines 870 ff., where the imaginary or hypothetical "opponent" was described in terms of his fears and complaints but did not speak directly, or in lines 41 ff., where the poet depicted the ridiculous actions of the man who claimed to be unafraid of death, and included the opinions of that man, introducing them by *ferunt*. As has been noted before, this method of using an interlocutor to present an opinion for the author to demolish must be considered the equivalent of the diatirbal *phesi*, and, therefore, must be taken as strong evidence of the poet's use of the diatribal style. In this instance (952 ff.) Lucretius has assigned the task of refutation through ridicule to his personified *Natura*, in contrast to his usual practice of conducting his own refutation. The demolishment of the foolish attitudes of an opponent generally is pursued with a polemical tone, often combined with *spoudaiogeloion*, a combination which is in evidence in 952 ff. as the personified *Natura* both attacks and ridicules the old man. Any humor in 952-962, however, is primarily of a bitter type, producing at most a smile as the audience recognizes familiar traits and realizes their foolishness. Polemicism, on the other hand, begins with the apparently angry commands,

aufer abhinc Lacrimas, baratre, et compesce querellas,

and continues into *Natura's* final command,

Nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia mitte
aequo animo agedum †magnis† concede: necessest.

XUM

The frequency of such imperatives, as well as their polemical tone, within the diatribe already has been mentioned (see above at footnote 64), and one should note additionally the brevity of the sentences containing these imperatives and of the other sentences within the *prosopopoiia*. Such brevity and its concomitant lack of periodic sentences is common within the diatribe (see chapter II, after footnote 110 and Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, I, p. 130),[68] as one must realize upon examining the style of passages quoted from Bion and Teles within this study, and may be a further indication of the diatribal nature, and inspiration, of 952-962.

To those traits which have been noted may be added the possibly proverbial nature of lines 957-958 which was discussed above. Even if these lines were not inspired by a common saying,the fact that they sound like a maxim or pithy saying must connect them with the diatribal habit of couching its message in phrases drawn from proverbial lore or created after the style of maxims. Additional evidence of influence from the Cynic-Stoic genre is provided by the presence of various rhetorical figures favored by the diatribe. Homoeoteleuton, as defined by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (IV, xx. 28; "similes exitus"), for example, appears in the *queratur* and *lamentetur* of 952-953, in the *inclamet* and *increpat* of 954, and in the *mitte* and *concede* of 961-962. To these must be added the examples of homoeoptoton which include *lacrimas* and *querellas* in 955, and *praesentia*, *imperfecta*, and *ingrata vita* in 957-958. Isocolon also is in evidence in the cola "non merito inclamet magis" and "et voce increpet acri" of line 54 and in the "aufer abhinc lacrimas" and "et compesce querellas" of 955. Further, the use of asyndeton in 957 and of an apparent wordplay involving the similarity of *aves* and *abest* is an additional indication of the rhetorical nature of the poet's style within the *prosopopoiia*. Two final figures worthy of mention are *transiectio* and *coniunctio*, which obviously are utilized for purposes of emphasis. The first of these finds expression in the separation of *omnia* and *praemia* in 956, of *imperfecta* and *vita* in 958, and of *aliena* and *omnia* in 961. *Coniunctio* appears only once, in the positioning of *elapsast* in 958 where the poet wishes to stress the fact that the old man's life has slipped away from him. The combination of all of these figures within the brief *prosopopoiia* of *Natura* in 952-962 seem to indicate that Lucretius has employed a very rhetorical style intentionally, since he knew that such a style was in keeping with the diatribal form which he was imitating. Further, the use of these figures, of a *prosopopoiia*, of an interlocutor, *spoudaiogeloion*, and a simple style, must lead one to the conclusion that the diatribal influence upon lines 952-962 is obvious and that those themes mentioned above which can be related to the diatribe but not directly to Epicureanism must be assumed to have been derived by the Epicurean poet from a diatribal source which also influenced his style.

Lucretius concludes his *prosopopoiia* with the remark that *Natura* (963)

> iure, ut opinor, agat, iure increpit inciletque,

which, like the conclusion of his first personification (950-951), harks back in its reintroduction of the author, who expresses his view of the remarks made within the _prosopopoiia_, to the style of the concluding statement of Bion's _prosopopoiia_ of _Penia_, in which the use of _doko_ must be considered the equivalent of Lucretius' _ut opinor_. One also should note within this sentence the poet's use of emphatic anaphora (_iure_. . ._iure_) and asyndeton, and the intentional similarity of of _increpit_ and _incilet_, a possible _paronomasia_ (cf. _Rhetorica ad Herennium_, IV, xxi.29-xxii.30), all of which figures are employed by the diatribe and which provide further confirmation of Lucretius' continued use of the style of that genre within the lines which follow his second _prosopopoiia_ (964-977).

After concluding his personification of _Natura_ the poet takes up the idea expressed in the "concede: necessest" and expands it by explaining (964-966)

> cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
> semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest;
> nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra.

Lucretius informs his audience, in other words, that ". . .the material of one generation is required for the production of another. . .," (Bailey, p. 1155) and that, therefore, no one is committed to the abyss or to Tartarus since (967),

> materies opus est ut crescant postera saecla.[69]

Further, according to the poet, these _postera saecla_ in their turn will complete their life spans and then die, giving up their atoms just as past generations have (968-969), in fulfillment of the rule that (970) vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.

In these lines which have just been paraphrased and quoted Lucretius obviously has expounded Epicurean doctrine, since he is alluding not only to the total dissolution of body and soul at death, a necessary occurrence if atoms are to be "reused," but also to the idea which he expressed in I, 262-264 (cited by Bailey, p. 1155) when he wrote that

> haud igitur penitus pereunt quaecumque videntur,
> quando alid ex alio reficit natura nec ullam
> rem gigni patitur nisi morte adiuta aliena.

The legal imagery with which the poet expresses himself in 971 (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, p. 155 and Bailey, p. 1156), however, seems to reflect a commonplace of consolatory or diatribal literature. The idea of life as a loan is a theme found, for example, in the *consolatio* section of *epicedia* (cf. Esteve-Forriol, p. 152; Stork, p. 102), as well as in Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* (I, xxxix.93) where the author comments that Nature ". . .dedit usuram vitae tamquam pecuniae nulla praestituta die. . ." (Bailey, p. 1156; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 220). Further, tomb inscriptions such as (Lattimore, p. 170; cf. Esteve-Forriol, p. 153)

> ἀλλ' ἀποδοὺς τὸ δάνιον πεπόρευμε ταῦτα πάντα κόνις,

and (Lattimore, p. 171),

> debitum reddidit,

also convey the idea of life as a debt which must be repaid by death. It is interesting to note concerning these inscriptions that, as Lattimore (p. 171) has stated, they are descriptive rather than consolatory, a distinction which could be applied to Lucretius' use of the image which serves to illustrate his point concerning the function of death. To these examples of the theme in consolatory literature and in tomb inscriptions must be added the Bionean fragment (Stobaeus, Flor. 105.56), "τὰ χρήματα τοῖς πλουσίοις ἡ Τύχη οὐ δεδώρηκεν, ἀλλὰ δεδάνεικεν," which often is cited as representative of the same commonplace as that mentioned above,[70] although, of course, Bion is referring to the fact that Fortune only lends, but does not give, advantages such as wealth, and he is not dealing specifically with the topic of life itself as a loan. Obviously the commonplace nature of Lucretius' remark in 971 prevents an absolute determination of a source which the poet might have used for it. The style of the Bionean fragment is close to that of Lucretius' statement, a factor which, in view of the poet's use of Bion in 931-963, might incline one to postulate a diatribal source, but, because of the frequency of the image's use, one cannot prove conclusively that the Roman poet relied upon the diatribe writer for this particular theme.

Following his remarks concerning life as a loan, Lucretius returns to the analogy which he developed in 832 ff., "proving" that the time after one's death will be just as meaningless as the time before one's birth (see above after footnote 10) and then adds the rhetorical question, which recurs to his discussion in 904 ff. and 921 ff.,

> numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur
> quicquam, non omni somno securis exstat?[71]

The importance of the analogy and its presence in consolatory literature had been discussed above, as has the similarity of the thought to a fragment of Bion preserved in the *Gnomologicum Vaticanum* in which the diatribe writer observes that sleep and the time before one is born are both the *didaskalias* of death (cf. above after footnote 53; Oltramare, theme 25b, p. 48 and p. 113 on Lucretius). The combination of the idea of one's insensibility before birth with the concept that death produces a loss of consciousness that resembles sleep may represent the poet's habit of alluding to topics which he has discussed previously, a habit with an obviously didactic purpose. Because of the use of Bion in 931 ff., however, one must assume that Lucretius also could have referred in 972 ff. to the periods of unconsciousness connected with sleep and with the time "quam nascimur ante," because he found a similar reference in the works of Bion or in sayings attributed to that "philosopher." Certainly Bion's "τὸν τε πρό τοῦ γενέσθαι χρόνον. . ." (*Gnomol. Vat.*, 160) bears a strong resemblance to Lucretius' (972-973)

> . . .vetustas
> temporis aeterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante,

and the poet's combination of two analogies which he had used previously could have been inspired by a similar connection made by Bion.[72] Further, the verbal similarities between Lucretius and Bion in this case and in line 971, which was discussed above, seem to indicate that the poet was influenced by the eclectic "philosopher" rather than by consolatory literature or by an Epicurean source in his employment of both "topoi."

Additional evidence for the influence of Bion or his imitators seems to be provided by the style which the poet adopts in lines

964-972. After he had concluded his second *prosopopoiia* with the remark in 963, Lucretius, as was noted above, expounds in a moralizing fashion upon the idea expressed by the "concede: necessest" in 962, developing that theme by means of explanation and an analogy and then attaching in a loose fashion the related ides of the nature of the unconsciousness which comes with death. This type of expansion must remind one of the technique utilized by Teles (probably following a method employed by his mentor Bion) at the conclusion of his quotation of Bion's *prosopopoiia* of *Penia*. After the remark "ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ <ἂν> δοκῶ ἄφωνος γενέσθαι," which may represent Bion's conclusion, Teles launches into a moralizing discussion of the tendency to blame one's difficulties or misfortunes upon old age, poverty, a chance meeting, the day, the season, or one's place (p. 8.6-8). This discussion is connected to what precedes it not only by the brief reference to poverty but also by the theme of one's inability to accept one's lot, a theme which harks back to the idea of dissatisfaction which produced the outrage of *Penia*. Teles conducts his discussion by means of an anecdote concerning Diogenes of Sinope and two similes, attributed to Bion, the first of which mentions the proper way to handle animals, and instructs one concerning the management of one's difficulties, while the second tells of sailors who learn to adapt themselves to the changes of the wind and the sea, even as one must adapt oneself to one's circumstances (see chapter II at footnote 111; D. R. Dudley, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67). Throughout this passage which has just been paraphrased the connecting thread is the idea of autarcheia or independence, which is the very antithesis of that dissatisfaction from which a man must liberate himself. If one does not recognize the connection between dissatisfaction and autarcheia, however, the section of the diatribe in which Penia appears and that in which the two similes occur seem to be unconnected or at best joined in a very loose fashion. One sees this "looseness" to a lesser degree in the Lucretian lines, but the connection between lines 972-977 and the section which precedes them (964-971) does seem to be nonexistent until one recognizes that in referring to "vetustas temporis aeterni" the poet is continuing the idea of the old making way for the new, stressing in this case the time before the present in which the hypothetical old man and the audience live. The connection is loose, but no looser than that employed by Teles.[73] In view of the similarity of arrangement, consisting of prosopopoiia, conclusion, moralizing comment, and analogies, one perhaps may assume that the rather free form of the diatribe, with its tendency to resemble a medley of thoughts and devices, has had some effect upon Lucretius in lines 964-977, although the poet's own tendency toward "suspension of thought" also must be taken into account (cf. Bailey, pp. 165ff.).

Looseness in construction, however, is not the only diatribal element which one finds in lines 964-977. Also indicative of the influence of the Cynic-Stoic genre are the brief, simple sentences which the poet employs throughout this passage (see above at footnote 68) such as, for example, lines 972-973,

respice item quam nil ad nos anteacta vetustas
temporis aeterni fuerit, quam nascimur ante,

which also reflect the diatribal style through their use of an imperative (see above at footnotes 64 and 68). Several of Lucretius' sentences, further, resemble maxims, another favorite device employed by the diatribe. For example, the poet writes in 964-965,

cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest,

expressing important Epicurean doctrine in a fashion which is easy to understand and to remember and which has the sound of a proverb detailing the inevitability of change, such as Terences' ". . .omnium rerum, heus, vicissitudost," (*Eunuchus*, 276; cited by Otto, p. 255) or Propertius' later "omnia vertuntur" (II, 8.7; cited by Otto, p. 255). Equally proverbial is the remark (970-971);

sic aliud ex alio numquam desistet oriri
vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu,

whose probable origin has been discussed above (see after footnote 69). To the other traits which have been mentioned must be added the use of a *somotopoiia* of *natura* in the remark (974-975),

hoc igitur speculum nobis natura futuri
temporis exponit post mortem denique nostram.

This *somotopoiia* is followed by the rhetorical question,

numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur
quicquam, non omni somno securius exstat?

a favorite device of the diatribe which in this case includes anaphora, in the repetition *numquid* and *num*, asyndeton, in the lack of connection between the three phrases, isocolon, in the similar length of each phrase, and, finally, a possible wordplay with *omni* and *somno*.

XUM

Additional examples of some of these rhetorical figures appear in the anaphora of nec in line 966,

> nec quisquam in barathrum nec Tartara deditur atra,

and the asyndeton of line 971, which also features chiasmus,

> vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.

Further, one finds an emphatic instance of adiunctio in the position of the verbs cedit and necessest in 964-965,

> cedit enim rerum novitate extrusa vetustas
> semper, et ex aliis aliud reparare necessest,

a positioning which makes the two lines chiastic. Another figure involving verb placement, coniunctio, is evident in the position of exponit within line 975, which is quoted above as an example of a somotopoiia. All of these figures and devices, when considered as a unit, are indicative of the rhetorical and diatribal nature of lines 964-977, and must be taken as further proof of the poet's conscious use of the Cynic-Stoic genre in combination with his didactic poetry and Epicurean philosophy.

Following the long section which includes his two prosopopoiiae and the remarks which follow them the poet adds a passage which provides moralizing interpretations of the stories concerning famous malefactors allegedly punished in the underworld, a passage which is linked to the preceding one by the reference to Tartara atra in line 966 (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 219; Bailey, p. 1155). The poet introduces his account with a statement of his theme, noting (978-979),

> Atque ea nimirum quaecumque Acherunte profundo
> prodita sunt esse, in vita sunt omnia nobis.

Lucretius' first example is Tantalus, concerning whom the poet declares (980-983),

> nec miser impendens magnum timet aere saxum
> Tantalus, ut famast, cassa formidine torpens;
> sed magis in vita divum metus urget inanis
> mortalis casumque timent quem cuique ferat fors.

Following Tantalus, who represents fear of the gods or superstition (West, op. cit., p. 98), appears Tityos, whose difficulties symbolize "irrational desire" (Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 223) and who is discussed as follows (984-994):

> nec Tityon volucres ineunt Acherunte iacentem
> nec quod sub magno scrutentur pectore quicquam
> perpetuam aetatem possunt reperire profecto.
> quamlibet immani proiectu corporis exstet,
> qui non sola novem dispessis iugera membris
> obtineat, sed qui terrai totius orbem,
> non tamen aeternum poterit perferre dolorem
> nec praebere cibum proprio de corpore semper.
> sed Tityos nobis hic est, in amore iacentem
> quem volucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor
> aut alia quavis scindunt cuppedine curae.

Lucretius continues his catalogue of famous malefactors with Sisyphus, the representative of "political failure" (West, op. cit., p. 101), and writes,

> Sisyphus in vita quoque nobis ante oculos est
> qui petere a populo fascis saevasque securis
> imbibit et semper victus tristisque recedit.
> nam petere imperium quod inanest nec datur umquam,
> atque in eo semper durum sufferre laborem,
> hoc est adverso nixantem trudere monte
> saxum quod tamen <e> summo iam vertice rursum
> volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi.

The Danaids, used as ". . .a type of ingratitude. . ." (Kenney, p. 227), or perhaps of dissatisfaction,also make an appearance within this section of book III, when the poet observes (1003-1010),

> deinde animi ingratam naturam pascere semper
> atque explere bonis rebus satiareque numquam,
> quod faciunt nobis annorum tempora, circum
> cum redeunt fetusque ferunt variosque lepores,
> nec tamen explemur vitai fructibus umquam,
> hoc, ut opinor, id est, aevo florente puellas
> quod memorant iaticem pertusum congerere in vas,
> quod tamen expleri nulla ratione potestur.

Next, after dismissing Cerberus, the Furies, and Tartarus with the flat statement (1011-1013) that

> Cerberus et Furiae iam vero et lucis egestas,
> Tartarus horriferos eructans faucibus aestus,
> qui neque sunt usquam nec possunt esse profecto,

Lucretius concludes his allegorical section with the explanation of the reason for the existence of myths concerning punishment. Thus, according to the poet,

> sed metus in vita poenarum pro male factis
> est insignibus insignis, scelerisque luella,
> carcer et horribilis de saxo iactu' deorsum,
> verbera carnifices robur pix lammina taedae;
> quae tamen etsi absunt, at mens sibi conscia factis
> praemetuens adhibet stimulos torretque flagellis,
> nec videt interea qui terminus esse malorum
> possit nec quae sit poenarum denique finis
> atque eadem metuit magis haec ne in morte gravescant.
> hic Acherusia fit stultorum denique vita.

The tradition behind Lucretius' use of these allegories has been a source of some controversy. Richard Heinze (_Lucretius III_, p. 184; cf. Bailey, p. 1158; Konstan, _op. cit_., p. 23), for example, has made the following comments concerning this passage:

> wohl aber scheint mir die Art, wie L. hier die Hadesstrafen behandelt, in eine epikureische Trostschrift nicht hineinzupassen. Es ist von der Bekämpfung der Furcht ein weiter Schritt zur allegorischen Deutung der Strafen auf die selbstverschuldeten Leiden dieses Lebens wie sie L. giebt.

Further, according to Heinze, who mentions the moralizing use of Tantalus in Teles (p. 34.9 ff.), the form to which Lucretius' allegories are most similar ". . .ist dem moralphilosophischen Tractat wie der moralphilosophischen Dichtung, die von Lastern and Fehlern abschrecken will (s. auch zu 1003), gleich angemessen. . . ." Bailey (p. 1157; cited by Konstan, op. cit., p. 24), however, has observed that "the scorn of the legends of Acheron, though it does not appear in the extant writings of Epicurus, was clearly traditional in the Epicurean teaching." As proof for his contention Bailey cites Diogenes of Oenoanda (Chilton, fr. 14), who claims that stories concerning Tantaluses and Tityoses do not frighten him, and Seneca (Epistulae Morales, XXIV.18, ed. Reynolds), who declares, "non sum tam ineptus ut Epicuream catilenam hoc loco persequar et dicam vanos esse inferorum metus, nec Ixionem rota volvi nec saxum umeris Sisyphi trudi in adversum nec ullius viscera et renasci posse cotidie et carpi: nemo tam puer est ut Cerberum timeat et tenebras et larvalem habitum nudis ossibus cohaerentium." Further, Democritus, whom Epicurus might have followed, wrote that (Diels, fr. 297; quoted by Bailey, p. 1158) some men, ignorant of the dialysis of their mortal nature and cognisant of "evil-doing in life," live in fear and create pseudea concerning the time meta ten teleuten. None of these passages, however, bears out Bailey's contention that (p. 1158) ". . .the allegorical interpretation of the legends is also derived from Epicurus himself. . .," for proof of an allegorical interpretation is missing.[74] The only text cited by Bailey which does mention allegory is Lactantius' (Div. Inst. VII, 7.13) remark that "Epicurus erravit qui poetarum id esse figmentum putavit et illas inferorum poenas quae ferantur in hac esse vita interpretatus est." Lactantius, of course, is quite late (3rd century A.D.), and, as Heinze has observed (p. 184, note 1), actually tells one nothing ". . .denn bei dem bekannten Verhältniss des Kirchenvaters zu Lucrez ist es durchaus glaublich, dass hier einfach der Meister statt des Schulers genannt wird." Even if Lactantius did not confuse the two, it is not impossible that his remark represents a later trend in Epicureanism, which, despite its conservative nature, could have adopted, as Lucretius may have done, the allegorical methods employed by other philosophies (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, p. 157).

Lactantius and the other ancient sources cited by Bailey, then, cannot be taken as convincing proof that Epicurus employed allegorical interpretations in order to explain away the stories of famous sinners in the underworld. By the same token one cannot use an argumentum ex silentio and assume that, since none of the fragments of Epicurus mentions such allegories, therefore they were not employed by him. An attempt to disprove the legends concerning the underworld certainly would have been in keeping with the philosopher's attempt to disprove the myths concerning the gods, and especially concerning the astral gods, since all of these legends and myths were a source of fear.[75] Epicurus' method for dispelling such fears, further, was to provide an explanation of the true nature of the gods, of the stars, and of natural phenomena in general, based upon the atomic theory, and thus to destroy men's fears by showing that they were groundless (cf. Kuriai Doxai, XII). Such explanations, of course, were not dependent upon allegorical expressions, which would have clouded the issue and which, indeed, would seem to violate those principles of clear expression based upon the ennunciation of the first ennoema kath' hekaston phthongon, which the philosopher delineated in his Letter to Herodotus (section 38). Rational explanations (which must be what Bailey means by "allegorical interpretation") of the legends dealing with punishment after death would have been in keeping with the philosopher's methods of explaining away the common fears of mankind, especially if Epicurus, like Democritus, attempted to show that such legends were the products of guilty imaginations and, in doing so, related specific legends to specific types of crimes.[76] Such a use of legend obviously would not be in violation of Epicurus' rules of clarity, since they would be explaining away mythological trappings which concealed a glimpse of human nature. Possibly one can see a similar process at work in the use of the myth of Phaethon in Lucretius, V, 396 ff. (cf. West, p. 103), or in the description of the rise of civilization (V, 925 ff.), which provides a "scientific" account devoid of, and indeed in opposition to, any reference to the traditional golden age. It does seem likely then that Epicurus could have rationalized the legends concerning the underworld, although one cannot prove that he did nor can one be certain of the form which such rationalizations would have taken.

The method which Lucretius employs, of course, might be taken as an indication of the general type of explanation which Epicurus would have used. The poet mentions the traditional myth, either first as in the Tantalus and Tityos sections, or mixed with the allegorical interpretations, as in the sections involving Sisyphus and the Danaids, applies the myth to contemporary man, and then adds a section explaining that fear of punishment on earth is responsible for fear of suffering after death. The section comprising 1011-1023, however, seems to be the only section which conforms strictly to the type of explanation which Epicurus would have favored, that is, a section which explicitly and clearly rejects myths concerning the underworld (1011-1013) and then provides a rational explanation for the origin of those myths. Lines 980-1010, on the other hand, do explain away the legends concerning the underworld and stress that these figures do not exist in Acheron, but, rather than explaining away, i.e., rationalizing, the origins of those myths in a specific fashion, Lucretius has employed them as allegorical representations of mortal fears or troubles. In contrast to his method in 1011 ff. the poet's system in 980-1010 does not claim that Tantalus, for example, owes his origin to some superstitious person's imagination, but rather, even though disclaiming its truth, uses the legend of that figure as a negative example to illustrate a point. The distinction between 980-1010 and 1011-1023 perhaps is a fine one, but it does exist, and perhaps may become clearer if one realizes that the poet's method in 980 ff. approximates that of the figure permutatio carried out per similitudinem, which the Rhetorica ad Herennium defines as follows (IV, xxxiv.46):

> Permutatio est oratio aliud verbis aliud sententia demonstrans. . . . Per similitudinem sic: 'Quid ait hic rex atque Agamemnon noster, sive, ut crudelitas est, potius Atreus?

Such Lucretian remarks as ". . .Tityos nobis hic est. . .," or "Sisyphus in vita quoque nobis. . ." seem to be related to this figure, although the poet intermingles allegory and explanation. Lines 1011-1023, on the contrary, lack the subtlety of 980 ff. and provide a more obvious and straightforward explanation, conforming to the principles mentioned in the Letter to Herodotus and to the explanation found in Democritus and in Lactantius.

One cannot state definitely, however, that Lucretius' method is un-Epicurean, since one does not know precisely what Epicurus would have done and since Lucretius does rationalize the myths by putting them in human terms, although he does not rationalize them by specifically explaining their origin,[77] as he does in 1011 ff. Epicurus and Epicurean material, of course, are not the only possible sources or models for the type of allegorical rationalization which Lucretius employs, for, as various scholars have pointed out, the Stoics, the Pythagoreans, and the Academics also employed allegorical interpretations of myths.[78] Further, the famous rationalization of the myth of Medea done by Diogenes of Sinope frequently has been mentioned in this study, and one also should not omit the work of Euhemerus and the Sophists. In his method of using the explanation of legends for a moralizing purpose, which essentially is what the poet does in 908-1010, Lucretius seems to be closest, however, to the method of Bion whose moralizing use of Tantalus was quoted and discussed above (see chapter II after footnote

500).[79] This description of Tantalus by Bion obviously is not the Roman poet's source of information, since Lucretius employs the form of the legend which tells of a stone hanging above the head of the malefactor (cf. Bailey, p. 1159), while Bion utilizes the story of the ever-receding food and water. Further, each of Lucretius' explanations (cf. West, op. cit., pp. 97ff.) presents some point connected with Epicurean doctrine, although one quickly must add that the evils of superstition, insatiable desire, the search for political power, and ingratitude or dissatisfaction are all themes which had a place within the diatribal tradition. Oltramare, for example, includes in his general list of topics themes such as "toute crainte causée par des croyances d'anthromorphisme doit être écartée. . ." (theme 92a, p. 64), "le désir est un mal. . ." (theme 78, p. 62), "les désirs sont insatiables. . ." (theme 78a, p. 62), "les passions asservissent. . ." (theme 84, p. 63), "l'amour passionné est un mal. . ." (theme 87, p. 63), and "le sage ne doit pas s'occuper des affaires publiques. . ." (theme 71, p. 60), all of which, of course, apply to different portions of Lucretius' remarks in 980-1010 and which could have been illustrated by rationalized myths in diatribes. A diatribal source (or sources) for 980-1010, then, is not an impossibility (cf. Oltramare, p. 112), although one probably should assume that here, as elsewhere in the diatribal section of book III, Lucretius has combined a technique used by the diatribe with Epicurean themes which he has adopted from other sources and then has added the section from 1011-1023 which seems likely to be of Epicurean origin.[80]

XUM

The chief importance of lines 980-1023, as far as the present study is concerned, of course, is not merely the source of those lines, but rather is the fact that they follow the obviously diatribal *prosopopoiiae* and remarks of 931-977 and act as a continuation of the diatribal style, fulfilling the function of the mythological examples or rationalizations commonly found within the Cynic-Stoic genre, as one of many other elements. Further, the rational explanations of Tantalus, Tityos, Sisyphus, and the Danaids provide brief *characterismoi* describing the behavior of certain types of men in a fashion which must be described as polemical, since these character descriptions obviously are intended as negative examples, illustrating the vices which one should avoid. The use of these character sketches, of mythological examples, of a polemical tone, and of various figures, such as the puns which West (*op. cit*., pp. 98 ff.) sees in *casum* (983) and *plani*. . .*aequora campi* (1002), the etymological play on *ferat fors* (West, p. 98; line 983), the anaphora with *nec* (984-985), the chiasmus of *impendens*. . .*saxum*, *Tantalus*. . .*torpens* (980-981) and of *volucres* . . .*angor* (993), the strong alliteration in lines 990-991 and 995-997, and the homoeoteleuton of *imbibit* and *recedit* (997) and *redeunt* and *ferunt* (1006), are all indicative of the diatribal style, as is the emphasis, produced by *ut famast* (981) and *memorant* (1009), upon the fact that the stories mentioned represent the beliefs of someone other than the author. Thus, even if the poet has used an Epicurean or otherwise non-diatribal source for all the 980-1023, he still has composed a section which fits within the requirements for the genre of diatribe.

Following this diatribal section concerning legends of punishment after death Lucretius adds an equally diatribal passage dealing with famous men who have died. The poet addresses an imaginary interlocutor and lectures to him as follows (1024-1052):

> Hoc etiam tibi tute interdum dicere possis
> 'lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancu' reliquit
> qui melior multis quam tu fuit, improbe, rebus.
> inde alii multi reges rerumque potentes
> occiderunt, magnis qui gentibus imperitarunt.
> ille quoque ipse, viam qui quondam per mare magnum
> stravit iterque dedit legionibus ire per altum
> ac pedibus salsas docuit super ire lacunas
> et contempsit equis insultans murmura ponti,
> lumine adempto animam moribundo corpore fudit.
> Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,
> ossa dedit terrae proinde ac famul infimus esset.
> adde repertores doctrinarum atque leporum,
> adde Heliconiadum comites; quorum unus Homerus
> sceptra potitus eadem aliis sopitu' quietest.
> denique Democritum postquam matura vetustas
> admonuit memores motus languescere mentis,
> sponte sua leto caput obvius obtulit ipse.
> ipse Epicurus obit decurso lumine vitae,
> qui genus humanum ingenio superavit et omnis
> restinxit, stellas exortus ut aetherius sol.
> tu vero dubitabis et indignabere obire?
> mortua cui vita est prope iam vivo atque videnti,
> qui somno partem maiorem conteris aevi
> et vigilans stertis nec somnia cernere cessas
> sollicitamque geris cassa formidine mentem
> nec reperire potes tibi quid sit saepe mali, cum
> ebrius urgeris multis miser undique curis
> atque animi incerto fluitans errore vagaris.'

The interlocutor is imagined as speaking to himself in these lines (cf. Bailey, p. 1166) and offering a series of examples (thus using an inductive process) to prove to himself that great men have died before him and therefore he should not ". . .hesitate to die. . ." (Bailey, p. 1166).

The basic theme upon which the poet constructs the "soliloquy" of his interlocutor is an old one. In Homer, for example, one finds the remark (*Iliad*, XXI, 105-106; cited by Bailey, p. 1166),

> . . .τί ἦ ὀλοφύρεαι οὕτως;
> κάτθανε καὶ πάτροκλος, ὅ περ σέο πολλὸν ἀμείνων,

which Achilles makes to Lycaon whom he is about to kill in combat and which bears a thematic resemblance to the Lucretian emphasis upon the deaths of great kings and philosophers who are, of course, "better" than the man whom the Roman poet addresses. A listing of famous dead men in order to illustrate the fact that death cannot be escaped seems to have been a commonplace of consolatory literature (cf. Stork, p. 134), being found, for example, in Ps.-Plutarch's *Consolatio ad Apollonium* (110D; cited by Bailey, p. 1167), which mentions Croesus and Xerxes. Further, the related theme "death is the common fate of all," appears in the *consolatio* section of *epicedia* (cf. Esteve-Forriol, *op. cit.*, p. 150) and in various tomb inscriptions, such as (Lattimore, p. 252; cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 232),

> καὶ τὸν ἀνάνκης
> κοινὸν Φερσεφόνης πᾶσιν ἔχεις θάλαμον.

Both the Lucretian and Homeric passages differ from the passages found in consolatory literature and inscriptions in that they are not directed at the bereaved, who are presumed to receive some comfort from the knowledge of the fact that the death of their loved one is not unique, but, rather, they are directed either at one whose death literally is imminent, as in the Homeric passage, or at one who is dreading

XUM

death, as in the Lucretian lines. The effect is still possibly one of consolation, but one cannot ignore the at once angry and straightforward tone of Achilles and the definitely polemical tone of Lucretius, which seems to connect that poet to the diatribe rather than to the consolatio.

Certainly the following remarks which the interlocutor allegedly addresses to himself are an attack upon a foolish attitude, despite their consolatory overtones (1045-1052):

> tu vero dubitabis et indignabere obire?
> mortua cui vita est prope iam vivo atque videnti,
> qui somno partem maiorem conteris aevi
> et vigilans stertis nec somnia cernere cessas
> sollicitamque geris cassa formidine mentem
> nec reperire potes tibi quid sit saepe mali. . . .

One might compare the tone of these to the following remarks by Sallust (Catilinae Coniuratio, 2.8; quoted also by Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 237), which reflect a similar state of mind:

> . . .multi mortales, dediti ventri atque somno, indocti incultique vitam sicuti peregrinantes transigere; quibus profecto contra naturam corpus voluptati, anima oneri fuit. eorum ego vitam mortemque iuxta aestumo, quoniam de utraque siletur.

Both Lucretius and Sallust are ridiculing a type of man who is incapable of actually enjoying his life, and each adopts a polemical tone, although Lucretius' polemic seems sharper. Perhaps one might see behind both of these accounts a diatribal theme dealing with dissatisfaction or with the man who is unable to profit from what he possesses (cf. Oltramare, p. 54, themes 46 and 46a). Lucretius' connection of the remarks in 1045-1052 and the theme of death as the fate of all, including great men, possibly reflects a diatribal source which dealt with both of these topics, and which, like the remarks of Bion preserved in Teles' Peri phyges, offerred a negative sort of consolation by ridiculing the listener's fears and showing him the common nature of the fate which awaited him.[81] Further, one might note that the use of famous men as examples, which, of course, is a common rhetorical device,[82] was a trait of the diatribal style which, for instance, might mention Themistocles' fate as an exile (Teles, Peri phyges, p. 22.14) or refer to Crates and Diogenes as men who grew old in poverty with no ill effects (Teles, p. 14.3ff.). Thus, a listing of famous men who have died easily could have found a place within a diatribe discussing death or misfortune. Lucretius' list, which has been composed with his Roman audience in mind, might be derived from a list within a diatribe or might owe its conception to consolatory literature. Whatever its origin may have been, however, when it is combined with the polemical remarks of lines 1045-1052, the list ceases to be strictly consolatory and instead becomes a part of the diatribe in book III, serving as a partial basis for the poet's attack upon foolish ideas concerning one's own ultimate fate.

Additional evidence for the diatribal nature of lines 1023-1052 is provided by the various traits, commonly found within the Cynic-Stoic genre, which appear within them. The polemical tone and use of an interlocutor, who, in this case, is depicted as giving himself a lecture, perhaps a standard variation of the diatribal phesi,[83] have already been mentioned. To these one may add, first, the use of improbe in line 1026, which, even though it is used by the interlocutor to himself, still reflects the same diatribal habit as do the stulte of line 939 and the baratre of 955, providing a further indication that the tone of the passage is polemical. The rhetorical question in 1045 is a further indicator of the diatribal style, serving, like the improbe, to augment the poet's polemic. One should note also concerning the tone of the passage that the implied antithesis between great men, such as Scipio and Epicurus, and the miserable fool who fears death must give the passage an overall tone of spoudaiogeloion in that the listener can be expected to laugh at the presumptuousness of the man who wants to live on and who is the object of his own polemic. Spoudaiogeloion and polemic often occur simultaneously or consecutively in diatribes, just as they do here, since polemicism actually is a part of spoudaiogeloion. To these diatribal traits must be added the actual quotation of Ennius' remark (Annales, fr. 154, Warmington; cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 233 on the diatribe; Ernout and Robin, II, p. 167),

> Postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit,

which Lucretius renders as (1025),

> Lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancu' reliquit.

This quotation highlights through contrast the polemical remark (1026),

> qui melior multis quam tu fuit, improbe, rebus,

which follows it. Lines 1034-1035,

> Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,
> ossa dedit terrae proinde ac famul infimus esset,

probably are intended as imitations (cf. Ernout and Robin, II, p. 169

and Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 234) or even as parodies of Ennian lines. Line 1035, in fact, closely resembles fragments 313-314 (Warmington) of the Annales (cited by Ernout and Robin, II, p. 169), which read,

> . . .Mortalem summum Fortuna repente
> reddidit e summo regno ut famul oltimus esset.

Lucretius' "famul infimus esset" obviously corresponds to Ennius' "famul oltimus esset." The epic tone of this Ennian imitation (1035) and of the probable imitation which precedes it (1034) and contains a tricolon crescendo (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 28) composed of epithets for Scipio contrasts strongly with the diatribal polemic found in 1045-1052. One, therefore, is inclined to think that Lucretius has exaggerated the epic style of 1034 in order to point out an ironical antithesis between the great Scipio, to whom so many epithets apply, and the lowly estate of the man who is the victim of the polemic. Further, this exaggeration, which must, therefore, be considered a parody, also contains its own irony, in that even such a famous man now has died and is nothing. Such a parody and the ironic tone which it contains is, of course, a device commonly found in the diatribe.[84]

Various rhetorical figures which appear in 1023-1052 further support the contention that these lines owe a debt to the diatribal style. Homoeoteleuton, for example, conforming to the definition of the Rhetorica ad Herennium (IV, xx.28), appears frequently. In lines 1025-1026, one finds the corresponding verbs reliquit and fuit, while lines 1027-1028, with occiderunt and imperitarunt, lines 1030-1033 with

XUM

stravit, dedit, docuit, contempsit, and fudit, and lines 1043-1044 with superavit and restinxit provide additional instances.[85] Homoeoptoton also makes an appearance, being found in the reges and potentes of line 1027, the repertores and the comites (and the genitives with them) of 1036-1037, and in the Epicurus, genus, and exortus aetherius of 1042-1044. To these figures must be added the possible wordplay of cessas and cassa (lines 1048-1049), the anaphora of adde. . .adde in 1036-1037 and nec. . .nec in 1048-1050, and the isocolon found in the similar length of the phrases iterque. . .altum, ac. . .lacunas, and et. . .ponti in lines 1030-1032, of the phrases in the tricolon in line 1034, of "tu vero dubitabis" and "indignabere obire" in 1046, and in the parallel lines 1051-1052,

> ebrius urgeris multis miser undique curis
> atque animi incerto fluitans errore vagaris,

which end with similar syllables. The alliteration of "s's" in 1047-1052, which seems to augment the polemical tone, also is worthy of mention, as is the repeated use of multus (as multis in 1026 and multi in 1027) and magnus (as magnis in 1028 and magnum in 1029), which obviously serves the purpose of emphasis and which bears the mark of the figure traductio (cf. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xiv.20).[86] All of these figures, if considered together, reveal a rhetorical style which, when appearing as it does here in combination with other diatribal traits, must be considered additional evidence of the poet's continued use of the diatribal style.

The concluding remarks of this section (1046-1052), which deal with the anxiety and discontent of the man, oppressed "multis curis," who, presumably, is not an Epicurean, provide a transition into a section dealing with the restless man and delineating the cause of that restlessness (cf. Bailey, p. 1170). Lucretius provides the following account (1053-1075), which must be described as a characterismos combined with Epicurean doctrine:

> Si possent homines, proinde ac sentire videntur
> pondus inesse animo quod se gravitate fatiget,
> e quibus id fiat causis quoque noscere et unde
> tanta mali tamquam moles in pectore constet,
> haud ita vitam agerent, ut nunc plerumque videmus
> quid sibi quisque velit nescire et quaerere semper
> commutare locum quasi onus deponere possit.
> exit saepe foras magnis ex aedibus ille,
> esse domi quem pertaesumst, subitoque <revertit>,
> quippe foris nilo melius qui sentiat esse.
> currit agens mannos ad villam praecipitanter,
> auxilium tectis quasi ferre ardentibus instans;
> oscitat extemplo, tetigit cum limina villae,
> aut abit in somnum gravis atque oblivia quaerit,
> aut etiam properans urbem petit atque revisit.
> hoc se quisque modo fugit, at quem scilicet, ut fit,
> effugere haud potis est, ingratis haeret et odit
> propterea, morbi quia causam non tenet aeger;
> quam bene si videat, iam rebus quisque relictis
> naturam primum studeat cognoscere rerum,
> temporis aeterni quoniam, non unius horae,
> ambigitur status, in quo sit mortalibus omnis
> aetas, post mortem quae restat cumque, manenda.

In depicting the foolish activities of the restless man (lines 1060-1070) Lucretius, as Heinze notes (Lucretius III, p. 198), is following the method of instruction involving ta parakolouthounta kaka tithenai pro ommaton which Philodemus recommends in his De ira. In order to present the kaka involved in restlessness, however, the poet has drawn upon the genre developed by Theophrastus, and used by Ariston of Ceos, and, indirectly, by Philodemus in his Peri kakion X.

Lucretius' character sketch, in fact, resembles the style employed by Theophrastus for his Characteres in that the description is based upon the activities of the man involved, which are described in rather short and simple sentences (cf., for example, Theophrastus' aedes and opsimathes), thus creating a picture which is vivid and easily understood. None of the surviving sketches by the Peripatetic philosopher deals with the type of character which the Roman poet describes, but such a person could have been depicted in sketches now lost or in the work of later Peripatetics such as Ariston, who, as was noted in chapter II above, delineates some characters which do not appear in the extant sketches of Theophrastus. One must assume that Lucretius could have known the work of Theophrastus or of other Peripatetics who wrote Characterismoi, but the poet's knowledge of the character sketch did not have to depend upon these sources. A common rhetorical device with which Lucretius must have been familiar was notatio or character description, defined as ". . .cum alicuius natura certis describitur signis, quae, sicuti notae quae, naturae sunt adtributa. . ." (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, 1.63). From the example provided by the Rhetorica ad Herennium (Ibid.), it is obvious that notatio and the Peripatetic characterismos are the same device, although the example given by the rhetorical handbook seems to include more dialogue than the typical character sketch by Theophrastus does. Lucretius, then, could have known and used the figure notatio as a result of his rhetorical education and may or may not have used Peripatetic character sketches as a source of inspiration. The sketch which appears in 1060-1070, at any rate, describes a common Roman situation (cf. Bailey, p. 1170) involving ". . .a well-to-do Roman, with a large town house and a country estate--a man such as Memmius and many of L.'s other (hoped-for) readers. . ." (Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 239), and therefore, even if inspired by a Greek characterization, has been given a totally Roman application by the poet (cf. Murley, op. cit., p. 385).[87]

The basic message of the character sketch is, of course, Epicurean. Lucretius wants to instruct his readers in the problems which beset the restless man who fears death, actually without realizing it, because he has not achieved that state of ataraxia which comes with the study and understanding of Epicurean doctrine concerning the nature of everything, including death (cf. Bailey, p. 1170; Kenney, p. 238; Epicurus, Kuriai Doxai, XI and XII and Letter to Menoeceus, 122, all cited by Bailey, Ibid.). The point of the section, of course, is that the Epicurean philosophy provides the solution for the difficulties which the poet depicts.[88] In presenting this message Lucretius continues to use the diatribal style, once again mingling Epicurean doctrine with the style of the Cynic-Stoic genre, and perhaps also with one of its themes concerning mempsimoiria (see Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 238) or dissatisfaction with one's lot (cf. Teles, p. 43.1ff.). One indication of the diatribal nature of this passage is, of course, the characterismos which it contains, since such brief sketches were commonplace within the genre. Further, the nervous activities of the character described must be considered a source of spoudaiogeloion,

XUM

for one must smile at the ridiculous appearance made by the restless man at the same time as one seriously views his problem and its causes (see chapter II at footnote 190 on humor within Bion's character sketches). To these diatribal traits must be added the homiletic or moralizing tone which the poet has adopted in this passage, and which contrasts with the biting polemic of the section preceding it. Lucretius still is holding folly up to ridicule, but his manner is more didactic and chiding than hostile (cf. Teles, pp. 8.6 ff. for a similar tone following a polemical section).

Several figures which occur in lines 1053-1075 offer further proof of the diatribal nature of the passage, since they indicate the rhetorical style in which it is written, a style which, of course, is characteristic of the diatribe. Chief among these figures is homoeoteleuton, which, once again, is used almost excessively. Thus in lines 1060-1061, one finds the verbs exit and revertit, which are chiastically arranged, while 1065-1068 contain tetigit, abit, quaerit, petit, revisit, fugit, and fit, which provided homoeoteleuton conforming to the definition provided by the Rhetorica ad Herennium. The effect produced by all of these similar endings is an emphasis upon the constant activity of the restless man. A second important figure involving verbs which helps to illustrate the plight of the character involved is adiunctio (Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, xxvii.38), a device which is evident in the emphatic position of exit, revertit, currit, oscitat, tetigit, abit, quaerit, petit, and revisit, all of which appear either at the beginning or end of their respective phrases. Those verbs placed at the beginnings of lines, of course, receive the most emphasis and are the best representatives of the figure. One also should take note of the position of possent in line 1053, which must be considered an additional example of adiunctio and one which places stress on the idea of being able to remove the source of one's difficulties. To these figures must be added the obvious asyndeton between the phrases "oscitat extemplo" and "tetigit cum limina villae" (1065), and between "temporis aeterni quoniam" and "non unius horae" (1073), which, in this second example, stresses the idea of eternity in contrast to the brief time in which a man is alive. Also worthy of mention is the use of the simile (1064)

auxilium tectis quasi ferre ardentibus instans,

which, since it refers to a commonplace scene, easily is understood and is compatible with the diatribal style. One should note additionally the chiasimus found in this simile and the line which precedes it, formed by the correspondence of agens and instans. All of these figures, when taken in conjunction with the basically straightforward style of the passage, with its homiletic tone, character sketch, and spoudaiogeloion, offer clear evidence that lines 1053-1075 have been written in a diatribal style and fit well with the diatribal sections which precede them.

After this passage concerning restlessness and its cure the poet concludes his diatribe with a section which repeats some of the topics with which he has dealt in lines 830-1075. Lucretius first asks his listener (1076-1077),

Denique tanto opere in dubiis trepidare periclis
quae mala nos subigit vitai tanta cupido?,

thereby mentioning the eagerness for life which he has criticized in his two prosopopoiiae and the remarks following them (931-971) and in his section ridiculing the man who wanted to keep his life even though so many great men had been unable to retain theirs (1024-1052). The rhetorical question and the emphasis upon mala cupido establish the moralizing tone of the remarks which follow it, as the poet observes that

certa quidem finis vitae mortalibus adstat
nec devitari letum pote quin obeamus,

and adds

praeterea versamur ibidem atque insumus usque
nec nova vivendo procuditur ulla voluptas,

taking the listener back, again, to the points expressed by Natura and by the author commenting upon Natura's speech (931-971). In his next three lines (1082-1084),

sed dum abest quod avemus, id exsuperare videtur
cetera; post aliud, cum contigit illud, avemus
et sitis aequa tenet vitai semper hiantis,

Lucretius reiterates the point which Natura made in 957-958, when she scolded the complaining old man and said,

sed quia semper aves quod abest, praesentia temnis,
imperfecta tibi elapsast ingrataque vita.

Lines 1085-1086,

posteraque in dubiost fortunam quam vehat aetas,
quidve ferat nobis casus quive exitus instet,

also must be taken as a partial reminiscence of lines 957-958 and of 959-960, et nec opinanti mors ad caput adstitit. . .,

in the sense that the exact time of death is one of the things which cannot be anticipated. These lines are followed then by the remarks,

> nec prorsum vitam ducendo demimus hilum
> tempore de mortis nec delibare valemus,
> quo minus esse diu possimus forte perempti.
> proinde licet quot vis vivendo condere saecla;
> mors aeterna tamen nilo minus illa manebit,
> nec minus ille diu iam non erit, ex hodierno
> lumine qui finem vitai fecit, et ille,
> mensibus atque annis qui multis occidit ante,

which remind one of the poet's emphasis in 832-869 and in 971-975 upon the total desctuction of consciousness which comes with death and of his use of analogies to one's unconsciousness before birth. Lines 1085-1094, of course, are dealing with the concept that death is inevitable and eternal, and that the length of time during which one is dead is not lessened by the living of an extremely long life. The emphasis upon eternity and upon the comparison of present and future time, however, resembles the method which Lucretius employed in the other sections mentioned and also seems to be intended to remind one of the poet's remarks in 1071-1075 concerning the difference between the _temporis aeterni_ of death and the comparatively brief time of one's life.

This discussion concerning the themes reiterated with variations in lines 1076-1094 has been intended to show that these lines do fit in well with the diatribal sections which precede them and that they can be taken as a proper conclusion for the entire diatribe,[89] providing the equivalent of the _enumeratio_ of the concluding section of a speech, just as lines 830 ff. partially served as an _enumeratio_ concluding the discussion which preceded them. One need not press too hard the connection of these lines with what precedes them, however, since rather loose connections between points or paragraphs is characteristic of the diatribal style and may apply also to the conclusion of a diatribe, although one cannot be certain, of course, that the conclusions of the preserved diatribes of Teles actually formed the conclusions of entire diatribes. Lucretius does make a very important point at the end of book III, a point which stresses the foolishness of trying to extend one's lifetime as long as possible and which, as was shown above, is connected loosely with 832 ff. and more closely with 1071 ff. as well as with the poet's theme in lines 1024-1052. Further, the use of this type of important and pointed statement reminds one of the conclusion of Tele's Peri apatheias (if it indeed is the conclusion) which ends with remarks concerning the good man's ability to withstand fortune (cf. Oltramare, p. 57, theme 57a). These remarks are, of course, related to the author's attempt to depict an ideal state of apatheia, but they do not contain any specific references to the earlier sections of the diatribe in which Teles dealt with the necessity of ridding oneself of emotions. The fact that the good man is the one who has attained apatheia, discussed in the beginning of the diatribe, and therefore also autarcheia, provides the connecting link between the beginning and conclusion of the Peri apatheia. Lucretius may have followed a similar method, although one cannot prove that such a method was indeed a common diatribal one, and one cannot help but notice that the Roman poet's conclusion bears a closer relationship to specific

XUM

themes discussed in his diatribe than does the conclusion of Tele's work. At any rate, one cannot dismiss lines 1076-1094 easily as an insufficient conclusion, but rather one must allow for the possibility that they represent a diatribal method or that they are intended to leave the audience with certain important points which the poet wishes to stress.[90]

One must note before concluding the discussion of these lines that their style follows the diatribal tradition also followed by lines 830-1075. The rhetorical question with which they begin, the style based upon short sentences, and the use of remarks such as (1078-1079),

> certa quidem finis vitae mortalibus adstat
> nec devitari letum pote quin obeamus,

and (1085-1086)

> posteraque in dubiost fortunam quam vehat aetas,
> quidve ferat nobis casus quive exitus instet,

which have a proverbial sound (cf. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 243; Otto, p. 369), all place them within the tradition of the Cynic-Stoic genre. Further, the spoudaiogeloion which is evident in the image of ". . .sitis. . .vitai semper hiantis," reminding one of Bion's remarks (Teles, p. 39.1 ff.) on the need to avoid giving chremata to the greedy (which contain a simile based upon a man with dropsy) and the facetiousness of the poet's final remarks concerning the impossibility of being dead for a "shorter" time are equally indicative of diatribal influence. One also may see in the sarcastic concluding statements some trace of an imaginary opponent, since Lucretius is holding up to ridicule an exaggerated version of an opinion which someone could hold unconsciously. By showing that even if one lives for *saecla*, the extent of time for which one is dead cannot be shortened, the poet has reduced to absurdity the desire of his opponent (ie., of "common opinion") to prolong his life for even a short period. Since such a *reductio ad absurdum*[92] is a common method used by the diatribe and by Lucretius in dealing with the views of an imaginary opponent or interlocutor, one may assume that in these lines the poet also has his vague adversary in mind. To this use of an opponent and of the other diatribal traits noted, one may add, as one final indication of the style of lines 1076-1094, the use of homoeoteleuton which has appeared so often in this Lucretian diatribe. Lines 1091-1094, for example, contain the poet's normal use of the figure with verbs having similar endings, as one can see in the resemblances evident in *manebit*, *erit*, *fecit*, and *occidit*. To this instance may be added lines 1085-1086 in which appear the verbs *vehat* and *ferat* as well as the three isocola *fortunam*. . . *aetas*, *quidve*. . .*casus*, and *quive*. . .*instet*.

With these lines ends the diatribe in Lucretius' third book. From the analysis of lines 830-1094 which has just been completed it must be evident that this section, despite its use of consolatory *topoi*, iis not a *consolatio* attempting only to comfort the still-living man who must die someday (cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 32 on the definition of a *consolatio*), but rather is a diatribe in poetic form which attempts to destroy through ridicule those wrong attitudes and opinions which produce the fear of death and make a man miserable. Lucretius' diatribe is consolatory in the same sense that a Bionean diatribe on death, exile, or _apatheia_ (especially in the face of grief for oneself or for others) is consolatory, in that it employs certain themes commonly found in the _consolatio_, the _epicedion_, and in tomb inscriptions and then uses those _topoi_ to point out the folly of certain attitudes. Both Bion and Lucretius, for example, indicate the foolishness of concern for one's burial, thereby taking the common topics of burial rites and death in a foreign land or in the sea and employing them as a means of destroying a common opinion through ridicule. The removal of concern for one's corpse may have a consolatory effect, of course, but the polemic and sarcastic tone employed by both writers in making their point must be considered foreign to the _consolatio_ as a genre. Thus, one should not assume that the presence of _consolatory_ topics within Lucretius III, 830-1094 implies that the poet has written a poetic _consolatio_, for one has ample precedents within the diatribal tradition (cf. Teles' _Peri phyges_ and _Peri apatheias_) for the use of such topics employed as part of a diatribe.

Further, one must note that the form of 830-1094 is that of a typical diatribe, another factor which removes the passage from the realm of the _consolatio_. The poet announces his topic in 830 and proceeds to "prove" it through a rhetorical argument employing analogy (in an Epicurean fashion). The appearance of a well-known proverb, of an ironic tone, and of an epic parody in this first section (830-869) are strong indications of the use of a diatribal style. In his next section (870-893), as was noted in the discussion earlier in this chapter, the poet employs _topoi_ and a form of enumeration found within the fragments of

Bion, and, in expressing his combination of _topoi_ and Epicurean doctrine, utilizes an imaginary opponent, two tragic parodies, a _characterismos_, and various rhetorical figures, all expressed in a tone which combines _spoudaiogeloion_ and _polemicism_. This same tone continues into lines 894-911 where the poet assigns dialogue to his imaginary interlocutor and then reduces to absurdity the commonplace and sentimental remarks made by that interlocutor. The possibility that these lines are a parody of topics and scenes commonly found in consolatory literature or in epigrams dealing with death is in keeping with the diatribe's fondness for parody and with Bion's tendency to ridicule such common topics (cf. Teles, pp. 30-31). Following this section of dialogue and response Lucretius inserts a banqueting scene which allows him to attack the idea that there is a sensation after death and to illustrate his point through an analogy. The use of a scene drawn from familiar experiences, of course, is a device frequently occurring within the Cynic-Stoic genre, and when combined, as it is here, with an interlocutor and a sarcastic tone, must connect the author to the diatribal tradition.

The next long section contains the two _prosopopoiiae_ which were discussed at length above and which reflect the diatribe in their style, tone, rhetorical devices, and themes, especially in the first _prosopopoiia_ but also in the second, where lines 961-962 seem quite close to preserved remarks by Bion. In his statements which follow these _prosopopoiiae_ the poet also seems to have imitated Bion, for, as was shown above, lines 972 and 973-974 reflect two Bionean comments. After his _prosopopoiiae_ and remarks following them Lucretius inserts a section (978-1028) which rationalizes legends concerning the punishment of famous malefactors in the underworld and then claims that the origin of fears concerning punishment after death is the guilty conscience of those who have committed evils while they are alive. Kenney (Lucretius III, p. 222) has observed concerning this passage that "L.'s explanations are relevant in general terms to his declared intention of enlightening mankind and freeing them from superstition (3.14-27), but seem somewhat out of place in the context of a consolatio." No such problem exists, however, if one assumes that Lucretius has written a diatribe rather than a consolatio, for such rationalizations or moralizations employing mythology were common within the Cynic-Stoic genre. Although one cannot prove that Bion or his imitators ever rationalized these particular myths, the technique is diatribal and must have been applied by Lucretius to myths which suited his purposes. The use of an enumeration of famous dead men, accompanied by the appearance of an interlocutor who is made to ridicule himself, the inclusion of a section dealing with mempsimoiria and the value of philosophy, illustrated by a characterismos, and a final concluding section which provides a succinct summary of previously-made points and ends with a thought which is both a reductio ad absurdum and a memorable remark complete the diatribe of book III and provide additional elements of the medley of devices which comprise it. All of the traits and devices which have been listed here are characteristics of the diatribal style, especially when they are used together with rather loose connections, as they are in this case. Some of these traits also occur within

7

XUM

consolationes (cf. Ps-Plutarch's Consolatio ad Apollonium), but the significant factor within 830-1094, which must be stressed again here, is the tone that Lucretius adopts, which often includes spoudaiogeloion and which never loses its sarcastic nature, even when its polemicism is softened by homor or by a tone which is more didactic or homiletic than polemic. This tone removes the poet's lecture concerning death from the realm of the consolatio and places it firmly within the tradition of the diatribes of Bion and Teles, which employed a similar tone even when dealing with consolatory topics. One does not console by reducing one's listener to ridicule, but one can attempt, as the diatribe does, to remove the source of difficulty through a combination of facetious humor and philosophical commonplaces.

Footnotes

1. Prof. L. Wallach, kindly has called my attention to the references to this Epicurean doctrine in Tertullian and elsewhere listed by J. H. Wasqink in his edition of Tertullian's De Anima (Amsterdam, 1947). Cf. Cicero, De finibus II, 31. 100 (ed. Th. Schiche, Teubner, 1969), who renders the statement as "mortem nihil ad nos pertinere. quod enim dissolutum set, id esse sine sensu, quod autem sine sensu sit, id nihil ad nos pertinere omnino."

2. I am using the terms for the sections of a rhetorical argument provided by the Rhetorica ad Herennium, II, xviii. 28. This treatise lists five parts of an argument (II, xviii. 28), namely, ". . .propositionem, rationem, rationis confirmationem, exornationem, conplexionem. . . ," and then gives the following description of their functions:

> Propositio est per quam ostendimus summatim quid sit quod probari volumus. Ratio est quae causam demonstrat verum esse id quod intendimus, brevi subiectione. Rationis confirmatio est ea quae pluribus argumentis corroborat breviter expositam rationem. Exornatio est qua utimur rei honestandae et conlocupletandae causa, confirmata argumentatione. Conplexio est quae concludit breviter, colligens partes argumentationis.[92]

   Also included are examples of "vitiosarum argumentationum" (II, xx. 31 ff.) which need not be quoted here. One should not assume that the poet is presenting his case in a loose fashion or that he, as an Epicurean, is so scornful of logic that he employs no set method of arguing his case (cf. Rist, Epicurus, p. 14). As in other cases where he has used a scheme resembling the epicheireme, Lucretius here seems to have adapted the basic formula to suit his own needs and style.

3. Concerning the Epicurean method, cf. DeLacy and DeLacy, op. cit., pp. 14 ff., pp. pp. 129 ff., pp. 138 ff., and the text of Philodemus' Peri Semeioseon. As the DeLacys note (p. 14), "according to the Epicurean method we infer the nature of unperceived objects by analogy with the objects of our own experience." Further, "an inference from signs is valid if it is inconceivable that the sign exists when the thing signified does not." Certainly no one can offer "evidence to the contrary" (cf. Ibid., p. 144) to destroy Lucretius' arguemnt which, therefore, must be held valid by Epicurean standards.

4. Cf. Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 162; Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 193; Stork, op. cit., p. 32.

XUM

5. Bonner, *op. cit.*, notes the references to Hannibal and the Punic War in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and comments that (pp. 22-23) ",...debates on Hannibal's dilemmas, which later aroused the ridicule of Juvenal, were evidently popular in the Sullan age, e.g., 'Hannibal deliberates whether, on being summoned to return from Italy to Carthage, he should remain in Italy, or return home, or proceed to Egypt and seize Alexandria' (III, 2,2)."

   See also, Traudel Stork, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-34 who mentions the use of historical *topoi* in consolation literature, and cites Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, I. 90 and I. 91.

6. Boyance, *Lucrèce*, p. 172, notes that Heinze postulates as a source for Lucretius a consolation that was Epicurean or "... interprétée par Lucrèce dans un sens épicurien." The French scholar adds, however, "mais l'hypothèse d'une source unique n'est pas vraisemblable pour une partie à la fois si peu dogmatique et d'un accent si personnel." Lucretius' diatribe may be undogmatic in its use of diatribal themes and traits, but its basic message and the arguments which occur in passages less heavily dependent upon the diatribe (such as 830-869) indicate that the poet was presenting orthodox Epicurean doctrines concerning the soul and that he, therefore, had an Epicurean source in addition to his diatribal ones.

7. Cf. Quintilian, V, XIV. 14, who observes that, "epichirema autem nullo differt a syllogismos, nisi quod illi et plures habent species et vera colligunt veris, epichirematis frequentior circa credibilia est usus. Nam si contingeret semper controversa confessis probare, vix esset in hoc genere usus oratoris."

8. Stork, *op. cit.*, p. 36, comments that, "die Argumentation, auf die sich Lukrez hier stützt, ist nur gültig unter der Voraussetzung, dass die persönliche Existenz in der Verbindung von Körper und Seele besteht."

9. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 196, thinks that line 843-846 have been "...admitted...for the sake of argument...." Cf. Bailey, p. 1136, whose translation of *si iam* as "...to suppose for a moment that..." gives these lines a force which supports the idea of an imaginary opponent.

10. As Kenney notes (*Lucretius III*, p. 196), "this contingency is not admitted, like is predecessor, for the sake of argument: Epicurus seems to have held that it was not impossible, and at 856 L. finds it easily credible. In its original, cyclic, guise the idea was Stoic." Cf. Bailey, p. 1134, who mentions the Stoic concept of rebirth or *palingenesia* and notes that "the idea was apparently accepted by Epicurus, though he naturally substituted for the Stoic idea of a regular cycle his own conception of the fortuitous recombination of the component atoms."

XUM

11. The development of this analogy, which expands the point presented in 850-851, might be classed as an *exornatio* since it does serve "...rei honestandae et conlocupletandae causa, confirmata argumentatione..." (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II, xviii. 28).

12. On the arrangement of arguments in a speech, cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, III, x.18. See also, Classen, *op. cit.*, p. 84, on Lucretius' general practices in arranging his proofs.

13. The present writer intends to investigate in a later study the possible use of rhetorical arguments elsewhere in Lucretius. Lucretius obviously is not following the style of Epicurus in his *Letter to Menoeceus*, 124-125, where the basic premise concerning death appears. Cf. Konstan, *op. cit.*, p. 17, note 37, on the derivation of the type of argument presented by Epicurus (*Ibid.*) from Aristotle, *De interpretatione*, XII, 21a34-21b5. See, for example, 21a38-21b2, where Aristotle writes (ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Oxford, 1949), "εἰ γὰρ τῶν συμπλεκομένων αὗται ἀλλήλαις ἀντίκεινται ἀντιφάσεις, ὅσαι κατὰ τὸ εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι τάτονται, οἷον τοῦ εἶναι ἄνθρωπον ἀπόφασις τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἄνθρωπον, οὐ τὸ εἶναι μὴ ἄνθρωπον. . . ."

14. See Classen, *op. cit.*, passim on traits of the exordium in the in the *prooemium* to book I. Cf. Rank, op. cit., who calls these lines the *Peroratio* and Kenney, *Lucretius III*, who calls them the conclusion.

15. Cf. Classen, *op. cit.*, p. 96, who comments that "while E. K. Rand's attempt to force the familiar five parts of a *logos* on the third book must be regarded as a failure, it is generally agreed that not only are the prooems carefully planned and executed, but also the final sections of each book are given special prominance and are composed with a view to the preceeding book, to the following book, and to the poem as a whole."

16. Ernest Dutoit, *Le Thème de l'Adynaton dans la Poésie Antique* (Thesis Fribourg; published Paris, 1936), p. ix. Dutoit does not mention this line.

Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 195, notes that Lucretius is referring ". . .to the Epicurean doctrine which he is to discuss at 5.235-415," although "his readers (as he obviously intended) were bound to think of the proverbial saying. . ." quoted below after footnote 17. Further, according to Kenney," what men speak of lightly is, whether they like it or not, going to happen. The implication is assisted by the syntax: after *non si* one would expect pres. subj., as at, e.g., Virg. *A*. 12. 203-5. . .; here the future *miscebitur* shows that this is a statement of fact, not a remote eventuality."

Cf. Heinze, *Lucretius III*, p. 164, who mentions the Greek proverb quoted in the present study after footnote 17 and observes "hier natürlich nicht in jenem sprichwörtlichen Sinne, sondern = 'und wenn die ganze Welt einstürzt.'" Heinze cites Juvenal II, 25, ". . .wobei der Anklang an L. zufällig sein wird." In the Juvenal passage the proverb has the force of an *adynaton* and is expressed with a present subjunctive.

17. A. Otto, *op. cit.*, p 345 records this remark; cf. Heinze, *Lucretius* III, p. 164.

18. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 193, summarizes the irony of 832-842, with the remark, "these events were, when they occurred, world-shaking and so presented themselves to a great national poet--but what are they to us now?"

19. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 193, notes that "...the suggestion of irony is characteristic of the diatribe...." He does not, however, connect the parody and the proverb with the diatribal style in this passage.

20. I have used once again the terms and divisions provided by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, II, xviii. 28, cf. footnote 2 above. I have classed lines 888-893 as the *exornatio* only to differentiate them from the *ratio confirmationis* and to indicate that they represent the poet's elaboration of the idea expressed by the "proof." Cf. Bailey, p. 1140, on the "confusing" nature of this arguemnt.

21. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 199, states that "this paragraph marks the point at which the diatribe-satirist...takes control of the argument: a comparison with the treatment of the same idea by the author of the ps.-Platonic *Axiochus* (365c) shows how L. uses rhetoric to enlist the emotional sympathies of his readers."

22. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, pp. 18-19 states that, "...the intention of these sermons was to inculcate a few simple lessons of conduct in memorable terms, and the speaker concentrated on enlisting the sympathies of his audience, so that it should appear as clear to them as it did to him that those who did not agree with the point of view expressed were fools...." Kenney does not notice the "interloculor" or the character sketch in lines 870-893.

23. Ernout and Robin, II, pp. 134-136 record this parallel and mention the use of the same theme as Ennius uses in Plato, *Theaetetus*, 179d.

24. Ernout and Robin, II, p. 880, refer to Lucretius' line 880 as "réminiscence évidente de l'*Iliona* de Pacuvius, où l'ombre de Polydore s'exprime ainsi (R^3 197...)..." and quote the lines from Pacuvius which appear in Warmington, II, as fr. 205-210.

XUM

25. This fragment is preserved by Cicero in his *Tusculan Disputations* I, XLIV. 106 (cf. Warmington, II, p. 238 and Ernout and Robin, II, p. 136), who comments, "non intelligo quod metuat, cum tam bonos septenarios fundat ad tibiam."

26. The effect must be that of a comparison, only in this case, half of the comparison depends upon the audience's recollection of the scene from Pacuvius and is not set out explicitly.

27. Cf. Esteve-Forriol, *op. cit*., p. 141, section I.

28. Oltramare, p. 113, connects this topic with the Lucretian lines.

29. Stork, *op. cit*., p. 58 writes that "aus Ciceros Abhandlung ergibt sich noch eine andere Beobachtung, und zwar der Hinweis auf die Beziehung der Konsolationsliteratur zur Popularphilosophie. In der Diogenes-anekdote nämlich, 1,104, wird in Inhalt und Formulierung mit Lukrez Vergleichbares ausgesprochen, volucribusne et feris... ferarum laniatus...nihil sentienti. Hinzu kommt eine Bermerkung Bions bei Teles p. 31, 1 ff. H....". See also, p. 59.

30. The Bionean diatribe may have been entitled *Peri taphes*; cf. Hense, "Prolegomena," pp. Cll-Clll, who cites Teles, p. 30.1. I owe this reference to Hense to Stork, *op. cit*., footnote 201 on p. 187.

31. On the sources of the *Tusculans*, cf. C. Buresch, *Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque Scriptarum Historia Critica* (*Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie*, 9, 1885), pp. 95 ff. (This study is listed by Stork, *op. cit*., whose bibliography has been very useful.) Buresch notes concerning books I and III that those books "...partim e Crantore, quem secutus est Cicero in Consolatione, partim ex variis fontibus quos scripturus Consolationem tantummodo inspexerat (ut erat inter filiae mortem et scriptionis initium brevissimum temporis spatium) haustos esse, ita tamen ut complures, velut Dicaerchi Chrysippi aliorum libros adderet: hoc probasse videbor, si et Crantoris et ipsius Consolationis locos passim per Tuscul. disp. libros I et III sparsos esse partim simplici enumeratione partim singulis quaestiunculis demonstravero."

32. P. Vallette, *op. cit*., p. 536; cf. Boyancé, Lucrèce, p. 172; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 202.

33. Cf. Varro, fr. 81, above in Chapter II, after footnote 365; cf. Bailey, p. 1142.

34. Jan Woltjer, *Lucretii Philosophia cum Fontibus Comparata* (dissertation Groningen, 1877), p. 169, cites both of these passages as parallels to the doctrine expressed by Lucretius in 870 ff.

XUM

Traudel Stork, op. cit., p. 187, note 192 lists two apothegmata concerning Epicurus' remarks when he saw, in one instance, a body being torn by crows, and in the other instance a body being torn by birds and wild beasts. In the second instance Epicurus makes the rather memorable remark that the dead man will not have the earth, from which he was born, as a tomb, but the bellies of birds and beasts, a remark which sounds more Cynic than Epicurean. Stork takes these two apothegmata from the Gnomologicum Vaticanum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 743, ed. Leo Sternbach (Texte und Kommentare, Eine Altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe, 2 Berlin, 1963), p. 117, fr. 303.

The practice of leaving the bodies of Roman criminals exposed to be devoured by dogs presumably was known to Lucretius.

35. This report is straightforward in the sense that Lucretius, as the "lecturer," presents his character's opinion without dialogue.

36. Rhetorica ad Herennium, IV, LII.65. Schrijvers, op. cit., p. 285, notes the use of dialogue and the "fictio personae" in this Lucretian passage and refers to the definition of sermocinatio given by the Rhetorica ad Herennium.

37. Esteve-Forriol, p. 137, section 27, C, lists Lucretius, III, 894-899 as an example of the motif "Klage Um Den Verlust Des Toten."

38. I owe this reference to Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 204, who quotes Lattimore's translation of the epitaph and remarks that it is "especially close to L. ...."

39. Quintilian VIII, iv.26, says of this figure, "potest adscribi amplificationi congeries quoque verborum ac sententiarum idem significantium. Nam etiamsi non per gradus ascendant, tamen velut acervo quodam adlevantur...."

40. L. P. Wilkinson, Ovid Surveyed (Cambridge, 1962), p. 150 states that "the famous poem recalling his last night in Rome sounds as sincere as anything he wrote....It is a sincere and vivid record of a poignant personal experience, a thing rare in ancient poetry, except on the subject of love or death...."

41. The typical Roman laudatio funebris at this period did not deal with such sentimental topics. Cf. Kennedy, The Art of Rhetoric, pp. 21-23.

42. The topic also must be considered Epicurean, of course, in view of its emphasis upon the loss of sensation, but, for the reasons mentioned, a diatribal rather than an Epicurean source seems highly likely.

XUM

One should note here that Lucretius' parody is directed at the sentimental and foolish views of his interlocutor and is not a direct attack upon the family life depicted.

Cf. Epicurus, Kuriai Doxai XL in Usener, p. 81, on mourning.

43. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 206 recognizes the satirical nature of these lines and observes that "the speaker is made to express the feelings of the bereaved in unmistakably satirical terms: L. is mocking the commonplaces of the formal lamentatio and the epitaph." Further, according to Kenney (Ibid.), "grief was recognized by Epicurus as natural (D. L. 10.119); L. attacks, not mourning itself, but its more extravagant manifestations." Cf. Waltz, op. cit., p. 96 (as quoted above after footnote 38).

44. Quoted from Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology, ed. J. W. Mackail (London, 1906), p. 278, poem XXXVII.

45. Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 172 also lists several examples of Latin tomb inscriptions.

46. I owe these references to Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 207, who states that "death as sleep was and is a popular idea (Lattimore 82-3)..." and notes that it is "...a standard ingredient of the consolatio...." Lattimore, p. 82, mentions the formulae somno aeterno and aeterni quieti et perpetuae securitati.

47. Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 208, comments that Lucretius "...as a good Epicurean disdains the trite symbol and turns it back on the innocent speaker: 'you talk of the dead being "at rest"; if you believe that, where is the sense in perpetual mourning?'"

48. West, op. cit., p. 29 (cited by Kenney, Lucretius III, p. 207) makes the following acute observations concerning 898-9 and 906-8:

> Instead of taking such statements as manifestations of L'Anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce, we should remember that each of these arguments is punctually and brusquely rejected by Lucretius speaking in his own voice, and later even more peremptorily by Nature, who takes over his part in the dialogue. Surely these pathetic rehtorical figures and astonishing rhythms are meant as sarcastic caricatures of the mawkish cliches used by such stulti and baratri. Insatiabiliter for instance is not necessarily an elevated word. Its only other use in Lucretius is of swine rolling in filth, 6, 978.

49. On the Epicurean attitude toward grief, cf. Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 172 and Usener, p. 138, fr. 120 (Plutarch, Contra Epicuri beatitudinem 20, 1101a). Cf. Bailey, p. 1143, who notes that in contrast to Lucretius, "Epicurus himself appears to have taken a more natural and humane view; he says that 'the wise man will grieve'...." See also footnote 43 above.

Woltjer, Lucretii Philosophia, p. 170 states "Num tamen tota ex Epicuri mente sit haec consolatio dubitamus; non enim convenit cum laudata animi ἀταραξίᾳ si mortem requiem habes vitae malorum. Pariter vituperat Epicurus qui mortem ut malorum maximum fugiunt, atque eos, qui eam ut requiem eorum, quae in vita sunt, tristium cupiunt...." Woltjer then cites the Letter to Menoeceus, section 125 (the last sentence within that passage).

50. Even though Lucretius uses the plural here (decant), I am taking it as a generalization and retaining the singular terms "interlocutor" or "opponent." Cf. Stork, op. cit., p. 78.

51. Cf. Otto, op. cit., p. 375 who lists examples of this same theme, such as Plautus, Most. 726, "Vita quam sit brevis, cogita"; Cicero, Phil.14, 12, 32, "Brevis a natura vita nobis data est"; Sallust, Catil. 1, 3, "quoniam vita ipsa, qua fruimur, brevis est"; and Publilius Syrus, 438, "o vitam misero longam, felici brevem."

52. G. Giangrande, "Sympotic Literature and Epigram," pp. 102, 104, 107.

53. Cf. DeLacy and DeLacy, op. cit., p. 142 who write concerning this method, "knowledge of unperceived objects, being mediate, is acquired by means of signs. Using objects of immediate experience as signs, we make inferences concerning the nature of the things which are at least in part unknown to and not experienced by us."

54. Because of its almost total lack of emjambment the diatribal passage (912-918) could be classed as an example of the expository style.

55. Cf. Heinze, Lucretius III, pp. 175-176; Kenney, Lucretius III, pp. 212 ff.; Bailey, p. 1149; Ernout and Robin, II, p. 146, Stork, op. cit., pp. 77 ff and p. 92 who briefly compares Bion and Lucretius.

56. On parrhesia, see Chapter II above at footnote 37. Cf. Giuseppe Scarpat, Parrhesia, Storia del Termine e delle sue Traduzioni in Latino (Paideia, 1964), pp. 62 ff.

57. This parallel frequently has been observed. Cf. Bailey, p. 938; Ernout and Robin, II, p. 148; Heinze, Lucretius III, p. 177; Stork, op. cit., p. 79. Woltjer, Lucretii Philosophia, p. 171 strangely attributes this remark to Epicurus and gives only Stobaeus, with no reference, as a source. Stobaeus, of course, has preserved the Teles fragment in which Bion's remark appears.

Cf. Murley, op. cit., p. 383 for the appearance of this commonplace in Horace, Serm., I, i.119

58. The idea of suicide does seem to appear in 943 in contrast to the theme found in 938-939. On the Epicurean views concerning suicide, cf. Bailey, p. 1152, who cited the Letter to Menoeceus, 126; Sen. Vat. IX; Cicero, De Finibus, I, 19.62, and, of course, the passage from the Tusculans (V, 41.118) quoted above.

XUM

59. Of course, if a personified *Natura or Penia* actually did rise up and begin to talk, the average man, like Shakespeare's Horatio (*Hamlet*, I,i) would "...tremble and look pale" and say,

> ...I might not this believe
> Without the sensible and true avouch
> Of mine own eyes.

60. Similar to isocolon, but appearing in different sentences, are the parallel phrases "eadem sunt omnia semper" (945) and "eadem tamen omnia restant" (947), which obviously provide a didactic emphasis upon Natura's contention that she can provide nothing new beyond that which already exists.

61. On the lacuna between *ergazesthai and ai*, cf. Hense's apparatus on p. 11.

62. These remarks may be the work of Teles, but since they are found within the same fragment in which the *prosopopoiia* by Bion appears and since Teles was heavily influenced by Bion, one might assume that they reflect at least the views of Bion, if not his actual words. One must allow for the possibility, of course, that Lucretius knew Bion through the work of Teles and therefore might even have known Teles' *Peri autarkeias*.

    One should note here that Lucretius seems closer to Bion-Teles than to Lucilius, fr. 568, a fact which would seem to indicate that both poets independently used a Cynic source, or that Lucilius followed Epicurus.

63. See also Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 215, who notes concerning line 945, "there is also a hint in what follows of the Epicurean doctrine that pleasure does not increase with duration...." Cf. Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, p. 177, who mentions *Kuriai Doxai*, XIX.

64. Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *op. cit*., p. 15.

65. *Sententiae Vaticanae XIV*, from *Epicurus, The Extant Remains*, ed. C. Bailey (Oxford, 1926), pp. 106-108.

66. Both of these usages of the theme are listed by Otto, *op. cit*., p. 81. I am indebted to Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 217 for the reference to Otto from whom Kenney has drawn his parallels.

67. One again the diatribal style of this *prosopopoiia* and Lucretius' obvious familiarity with diatribal literature (which is proved by the style and content of III, 931 ff. and of several *prooemia*) must lead one to assume that Lucretius rather than his Epicurean source has produced this mixture.

68. Cf. Stork, *op. cit.*, p. 86 on the imperatives and p. 93 where she writes that "im zweiten Teil der Rede, V. 955, der im ganzen stärker aggressiv wirkt, sind die Sätze kürzer oder wenigstens parataktisch verbunden, in V. 957-960."

69. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 219 observes that "by saying that nobody is sent down to Tartarus L. kills two birds (if not three) with one stone: he states the dogma that matter cannot be annihilated (cf. 967 n.) in terms that bring it home to the individual, who is still being addressed (968-9); he also gets in a hit at popular notions of death (which are implied to be absurdly wasteful) and hints at the subject of his next paragraph."

70. Cf. Bailey, p. 1156; Ernout and Robin, II, p. 155; Heinze, *Lucretius III*, p. 182; Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 220.

71. On these lines cf. Woltjer, *Lucretii Philosophia*, pp. 77-78 who refers to the similar theme in Plutarch's *Cons. ad Apollon.* 15, tracing it back to Crantor.

72. Oltramare, p. 113, observes concerning 972-977, " souvent aussi il se sert des comparaisons diatribique de la mort avec le sommeil et avec l'éternité qui précéda notre naissance (th.25b). . . ." Oltramare's theme 25b is based upon Bion's remark recorded by the *Gnomologicum Vaticanum*.

73. This passage in Teles with which I have compared the Lucretian lines is not necessarily Lucretius' model. I have chosen it for use as a comparison since it contains a *prosopopoiia* and since it seems to be a typical example of the style of Bion and Teles.

74. The Democritean one does seem to connect one's present actions and fears with the creation of stories concerning Hades, but a definite reference to allegory does not seem to be included. Cf. Konstan, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-26.

75. Cf. Festugière, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-72 and 73-93; B. Farrington, *The Faith of Epicurus*, p. 123.

76. Cf. Konstan's discussion of Epicurean psychology, pp. 20-27; Boyancé, Lucrèce, p. 181 (quoted by Konstan, p. 24). This is perhaps similar to the type of rationalization mentioned by Lactantius. See also *Kuriai Doxai*, XXXIV and XXXV (cited by Bailey, p. 1164) which deal with the problem of a "guilty conscience" and may be an indication that Epicurus would have dealth with the myths of the underworld in psychological terms.

77. One must note here that rationalization can take two forms. The first is the type employed by Diogenes, perhaps also by Epicurus, and by Lucretius in 1011-1023, which explains the origin

XUM

of a myth. The second is the type employed by Bion in his use of Tantalus and by Lucretius in 980-1010, which explains a myth in a moralizing fashion, thereby using that myth to illustrate a moral point employing the method which could be called "allegorical interpretation," although sometimes, as in Bion, the myth acts almost as a simile.

78. Cf. Konstan, *op. cit.*, pp. 23ff; Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, pp. 178 ff. (cf. Konstan, pp. 23-24 on Boyancé, pp. 180-181); J. Cousin, "Lucrèce, Les Verseuses et la *Vita Stultorum* (De Nat. Rer., III 1003 sq.), "*Mélanges de Philologie, de Littérature, et de'Histoire Anciennes Offerts à Alfred Ernout* (Paris, 1940), 97-106; Ernout and Robin, II, p. 157. But cf. SVF, I, 147 on Zeno (cited by Ernout and Robin, *Ibid.*) and West, *op. cit.*, p. 103 on Chrysippus, who ". . .so reconciled the old poetic myths to his own theology that he made out the ancient poets to be Stoics."

79. Oltramare, p. 112, assumes that the ". . .interprétation des mythes infernaux. . ." in 978-1010 is a diatribal trait.

80. Boyancé, *Lucrèce*, pp. 180-181 (cited by Konstan, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-24) mentions parallels between Lucretius' 1023 and Philo Judaeus. Philo, of course, was influenced by the diatribe (cf. Wendland, *op. cit.*), but one unfortunately cannot build a case for diatribal influence upon Lucretius, 1011-1023, on the basis of this one correspondence. Thus, an Epicurean source for those lines must seem to be the most likely one. Concerning the allegorical section (980-1023) Boyancé comments that a likely source for Lucretius was a mixture of Pythagorean, Platonic, and Stoic themes and observes "et il s'agit, selon moi, de l'Académie contemporaine de Philon et de Virgile, celle qui est revenue au dogmatisme avec Antiochus d'Ascalon." Further, according to Boyancé, Lucretius has adapted or adopted these myths "sans doute parce qu'elle lui a paru rendre raison de la naissance des mythes, expliquer comment les hommes ont pu se laisser égarer par eux." The present writer agrees with Boyancé concerning everything except the probable source, for although it may, indeed, be Academic, one must allow for the possibility of a diatribal source as well, in view of the poet's previous use of Bion.

81. On the relationship between this passage and the diatribe, see also Bruno Lavagnini, "Motivi Diatribici in Lucrezio e in Giovenale," *Athenaeum* N.S. 25 (1847), 83-88, who discusses 1024ff. and refers (p. 84) to Oltramare's theme 25d, "la mort est *l'egalisatrice* de toutes les conditions humaines." See also G.-B Conte, "Il 'Trionfo della Morte' e la Galleria dei Grandi Trapassati in Lucrezio III 1024-1053," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 37 (1965), pp. 117-118 on the diatribe and the *consolatio*; cf. Vallette, *op. cit.*, p. 534.

XUM

82. Cf. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 232. See also Richard Kohl, *De Scholasticarum Declamationum Argumentis ex Historia Petitis* (*Rhetorische Studien,* 4, Paderborne, 1915), pp. 17 (Xerxes), pp. 94-96 (Scipio).

83. This process reminds one of the diatribal themes "il faut *s'accuser soi-même*. . ." (Oltramare, p. 55, theme 50b), "il faut faire son *examen de conscience*. . ." (theme 50d), and "il faut *s'adresser des reproches*. . ." (theme 50e). These themes appear later than Lucretius, but they may reflect an earlier tradition which the poet could have followed. The device itself, at any rate, must be rhetorical (cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, IV, on such figures as *sermocinatio*, Lii. 65, and its special variety, the *sermocinatio consequens*).

84. To these imitations may be added lines 1042-1044 concerning Epicurus, which seem to have been modelled upon the following epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (Gow and Page, 2147-2150); cited by Ernout and Robin, II, p. 170 and Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 236):

> Ἄστρα μὲν ἠμαύρωσε καὶ ἱερὰ κύκλα Σελήνης
> ἄξονα δινήσας ἔμπυρος Ἠέλιος,
> ὑμνοπόλους δ'ἀγεληδὸν ἀπημάλδυνεν Ὅμηρος
> λαμπρότατον Μουσέων φέγγος ἀνασχόμενος.

85. See also lines 1046-1052 with their verbs *conteris, stertis, geris, urgeris and vagaris*.

86. Cf. Conte, *op. cit*. in footnote 81, p. 122, who writes of a stylistic *auxesis* produced by the use of *multis, multi* and *magnis, magnum*. See also Schrijvers, *op. cit*., p. 231.

87. Kenney, *Lucretius III*, p. 239, notes that line 1058ff. ". . .are reminiscent of the Soldier's Chorus in Ennius' *Iphigenia*, Sc. 234-41, V. 2 (195-202 Jocelyn)," and adds "that soldiers in a tragedy should moralize in this way shows the power of the semi-philosophical commonplace (already well established in Euripides)." One might add that these lines also show the pervailing influence of the *characterismos*.

88. Kenney, *op. cit*. above, p. 241 notes concerning line 1973, "unius horae," that "L.'s implication is apparently that if we fix our attention on the great questions of philosophy, which include death and the eternal extinction of body and soul, we shall achieve ἀταραξία and boredom will disappear."

XUM

89. Cf. Bailey, p. 1173, who sees this passage as ". . .a series of disconnected points," and comments that it ". . .is unsatisfactory as a conclusion."

90. One also must note as Kenney does (*Lucretius* III, p. 242) that "perhaps it suffices to say that it seems as good a way to end the book as any; only Book I, as Heinze remarks, is rounded off with anything like a formal epilogue." Kenney also notes that "some of the arguments we have admittedly met before, but some are new." Possibly abrupt endings should be considered the norm in Lucretius, and perhaps one should allow for some influence from the Greek archaic style, on which see van Groningen, *op. cit.*, passim.

91. These lines (1090-1094) remind one of the exchange in Teles' *Peri Apatheias* (p. 61.2ff.) which also seems to be a *reductio ad absurdum*. In a section concerned with death and one's attitude toward it, one speaker observes that a friend who has died *ouketi estai*. The second speaker replies, "οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν μυριοστὸν ἔτος, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς προπάππους σου. σὺ δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τούτῳ οὐκ ἄχθῃ, ὅτι δὲ εἰς ὕστερον οὐκ ἔσται, δυσχεραίνεις."

XUM

Chapter IV

EPILOGUE

Concerning the peroratio or epilogue of a speech, Quintilian (VI, 1.1) has observed that "in hac, quae repetemus, quam brevissime dicenda sunt et, quod Graeco verbo patet, decurrendum per capita. Nam, si morabimur, non iam enumeratio sed quasi altera fiet oratio." This epilogue, therefore, will dispense with the amplificatio and the commiseratio (which, hopefully, is unnecessary), recommended by the Rhetorica ad Herennium as parts of the conclusio, and will present only an ennumeratio mentioning some of the major points made within the present investigation and indicating some areas in which further investigations are needed.

Chapter II, first of all, indicated the problems inherent in the use of the term "diatribe" and then presented a basic definition of the genre as a type of thesis, exhortative and polemical by nature, which was composed of a medley of various devices, including the employment of an imaginary interlocutor, and which dispensed a popularized philosophy aimed at the problems of daily life. Possibly created by Antisthenes or by Crates and other early Cynics this genre, which could be described as a "homily," seems to have been given its final form by the eclectic Bion of Borysthenes, whose work survives in fragments preserved chiefly by his imitator Teles. By studying the remains of the diatribes of Teles and the Bionean passages preserved within them one can isolate those traits which, when used in combination are indicative of the diatribal style. The frequent, but not exclusive, use of a polemical tone directed against common vices and follies, the employment of direct address to the listener, and the creation of an imaginary opponent, representing a commonly held opinion, whose views are attacked and demolished, are three of the most important characteristics found in the work of both diatribists, as well as in later examples of the genre. To these must be added the employment of spoudaiogeloion, that mixture of serious criticism and humor which is a ". . .method of 'speaking the truth under cover of a jest,'" (M. Grant, op. cit., p. 20), and which finds expression in various fragments of Bion and Teles. Additional traits of the Bionean diatribe include the use of short sentences, of anecdotes, apothegms, verse parodies or quotations, fables, antitheses; comparisons, personifications and, finally, of certain rhetorical devices which are favored also by later diatribists. Most of these traits occur, of course, in other literary and subliterary genres, but it is their use in combination and the general looseness of their connection that gives the diatribe its distinct generic form. Thus, while the quotation or parodying of verse and the use of anecdotes, for example, might be used within a forensic speech or a philosophical treatise, one would not find the aggregate of the other traits mentioned, combined with a moralizing theme, within any genre other than the diatribe itself or an imitation of it (cf. Horace, II, 3, and Lucretius, III, 830 ff.).

The influence of the diatribe after Bion and Teles was widespread, as Chapter II has shown, and affected the work of poets and prose writers alike. The Peripatetic Ariston of Ceos, for example, was called the emulator of Bion, an epithet which seems to be supported by the diatribal nature of his epitome concerning hyperephania. Possibly Ariston of Chios, the Stoic who was almost a Cynic, also wrote and delivered diatribes, but the problems inherent in the confusion between the two Aristons evident in Diogenes Laertius' list of works by Ariston of Chios prevent one from definitely stating that the Stoic worked within the diatribal tradition. Part of the work on hyperephania and fragments of a collection of character sketches by Ariston of Ceos, the Peripatetic, have been preserved in the fragments of Philodemus' Peri Kakion and serve as one indication of the Epicurean philosopher's acquaintance with the diatribal style through the Peripatetic's work. Evidence for Philodemus' direct use of Bion himself is not lacking, however, for the diatribist is cited and imitated by the Epicurean within the diatribal treatise De Ira, while Philodemus' De Morte, IV, also a diatribal treatise, strongly reflects the stylistic traits and even the content of fragments of Bion's Peri Taphes preserved by Teles.

To the list of those influenced by the diatribal style must be added the Cynic author Menippus, whose satirical works, which mingled prose and poetry, may have been influenced by the habits of the diatribe, which frequently inserted poetic passages into prose passages (cf. Hense, "Prolegomena," p. XCVI). Some idea of the style of Menippus can be gleaned from the work of the Roman writer Varro, whose Menippeans were, as he himself notes (in a conversation "reported" by Cicero; cf.

Hirzel, I, p. 380, note 3), imitations and not interpretations of Menippus. Since the ancient theory of imitation allowed an author considerable freedom (cf. D. R. Dudley, A History of Cynicism, p. 70; Fiske, op. cit., passim), one cannot assume that Varro's work necessarily is an exact imitation of Menippus. The Roman writer had to observe the stylistic rules of the genre in which he was working, however, and also had to include within his work sufficient traits found in his model to allow the reader to recognize the Greek original which the author was emulating (cf. Fiske, op. cit., passim). Despite the lack of fragments of Menippus and the scarcity of fragments of Varro's Menippeans, then, one can draw from the remains of Varro evidence that the style of both authors was rhetorical, included a mixture of prose and verse, employed an interlocutor occasionally (whether real or imaginary), and was not lacking in polemicism and spoudaiogeloion. These traits allow one to include Menippus and Varro within a discussion of the influence of the diatribal style, although one must stress that the Menippean satire is not a diatribe but only a genre which seems to be a product of the same Cynic tradition.

The use of the diatribe itself, of course, was not limited to the Cynics who developed the genre. As was noted in Chapter II, Ariston of Ceos may have written diatribes in addition to those works in which he obviously imitated the diatribal style. Further, some Stoics also employed the genre, although Panaetius, a Stoic especially interested in good style, criticized those Stoics who were "paene Cynici" in their use of parrhesia. Panaetius' criticisms do not refer specifically to those Stoics who delivered diatribes, but the existence of Stoic "preachers" is known from various references in Roman literature (see Chapter II, section F, and Oltramare, op. cit., pp. 126-137). Further, the style and form of a typical diatribe delivered by one of these "preachers," Stertinus, can be deduced from the probably exaggerated version of a diatribe delivered by the former art dealer Damasippus to Horace in Serm II, 3. This diatribe, based upon the Stoic paradox "all men are mad," is composed of a loosely connected medley of themes and devices, including an imaginary interlocutor, direct address, poetic parodies, and the use of anecdotes and of comparisons drawn from common experiences. The aggregate of themes and devices when compared with the style and organization of the Bionean diatribe, permits one to state that Horace has allowed his character Damasippus to deliver a diatribe in poetic form.

Prior to Horace this same Stoic paradox had been treated by Cicero in his Paradoxa Stoicorum, a series of rhetorical exercises which have been called diatribes (see Chapter II, section H), but which seem only to have been influenced by that genre, to which they do not belong but to which they are related as a type of thesis. Paradoxon IV, for example, deals with the paradox mentioned above, but uses that topic in order to attack Cicero's enemy Clodius, who already was dead at the time when Cicero was composing this work. Through a skillful use of the rhetorical "constitutio definitiva," of questions directed at Clodius, of antitheses, and of rhetorical arguments, Cicero systematically presents himself in a favorable light, while he presents Clodius as an enemy of the state. As the analysis in Chapter II indicated (see after footnote 441), Paradoxon IV, in spite of its announced theme, is not a Stoic diatribe, but rather is what amounts to a "legal" indictment of Cicero's enemy, based on the "constitutio definitiva" and developed as if the author were arguing in a court of law. This rhetorical composition obviously is not a homily on a moral topic, and it lacks spoudaiogeloion and most of the other major traits of the diatribal style. Further, even though Cicero does use Clodius as an interlocutor, and even though Clodius obviously is dead and therefore imaginary, the orator is not dealing with a "common opinion," as the diatribist does, but, rather, he is attacking a specific opponent with legalistic arguments. Probably Cicero's use of Clodius and the diatribe's use of phesin have their roots in a common rhetorical tradition, and one cannot trace Cicero's legalistic use of a named interlocutor back to the diatribal tradition (cf. Norden, Die Antike Kunstprosa, I, p. 129 on the diatribe and declamation). In contrast to Paradoxon IV, Paradoxon I contains many of the features of the Bionean diatribe, but it still is a rhetorical exercise and not a true representative of the Cynic-Stoic genre (cf. Haury, op. cit., pp. 180-181). Cicero deals with the paradox "quod honestum sit id solum bonum esse," and develops his theme by using an anecdote, rhetorical questions, a possible reference to an imaginary interlocutor (cf. section 9 of the Paradoxon), illustrations drawn from history and delivered in the form of rhetorical questions, and an attack, delivered through rhetorical arguments, against those who believe that pleasure is a good. As one may see from this enumeration, many of the common traits of the diatribe are included by the orator, but he does not use any reference to poets or poetic quotations, a really strong polemical tone directed against some vice rather than only against an opposing philosophical view, and, above all, any real spoudaiogeloion. The lack of these traits prevents one from calling Paradoxon I a diatribe of the Bionean type, and one rather must consider it, and, indeed, the other Paradoxa, as theses or rhetorical exercises, which, like all theses, have some traits in common with the genre of the diatribe.

The influence of the genre used by Cynics and by Stoics who were "almost Cynics," but not by Cicero, extends beyond those writers who actually used the genre or its relative, the Menippean satire, and reaches into the sphere of poetry. Among Hellenistic Greeks, for example, was Cercidas (3rd century B.C.), a Cynic who wrote "meliamboi" employing Cynic themes and using the polemical tone (cf. Dudley, A History of Cynicism, pp. 74 ff; Geffcken, op. cit., p. 19) of a diatribist attacking vices, especially in the fourth fragment of his work which matches the facetious outrage of Bion's Penia as it attacks "social inequality" (Dudley, p. 78). In addition to Cercidas, one may cite Phoenix of Colophon (cf. Gerhard, op. cit., passim), whose poems may have been influenced by Cynic themes, and the famous Leonidas of Tarentum who wrote of "his wandering frugal life" (AP VII, 736; Gow and Page, 2167) and indicated ". . .an interest in the Cynics, writing on the death of Diogenes, and on an unworthy follower of his," (Dudley, pp. 114-115; Geffcken, p. 4; AP VII, 67; Gow and Page, 2331). Further, one of Leonidas' epigrams deals with Bion's remark concerning the road to Hades (Dudley, p. 115; Stobaeus, 120, 9), while another poem (AP VII, 472; Gow and Page, 2443; Dudley, p. 115) warns of the brevity of life and urges the listener to live frugally, commonplace themes, of course, but possibly derived from Cynic sources in view of the author's connection with those philosophers (cf. Dudley, p. 115). One cannot call any of these poems "diatribes in poetic form" (cf. Geffcken, p. 6; Dudley, p. 115), since they do not conform sufficiently to the form of the genre which has been described in this study. The presence of Cynic themes and of the polemical tone of the diatribe in these works, however, serves to show that Cynic influenceswas not limited to prose genres, and, in the case of Cercidas' fragment 4 and of Leonidas' poem dealing with a Bionean themes, one may assume some influence from the diatribal tradition.

To those Greek poets who were influenced in varying degrees by the Cynics or by the diatribe must be added the Roman poets Ennius and Lucilius whose satires may reflect the medley-like style of Bion and his imitators. The fragments of Ennius' Saturae are too scantly to allow one to discover any firm evidence of direct diatribal influence, however, and none of the stylistic traits of Ennius is exclusively diatribal, as Chapter II has indicated. A better case can be made for diatribal influence upon the poet Lucilius, concerning whom Pseudacro (cf. Chapter II, footnote 485) observes "sunt autem disputationes Bionis philosophi quibus stultitiam vulgi arguit, cui paene consentiunt carmina Luciliana." The fragmentary nature of the evidence once again hinders any attempt to draw firm conclusions, but the aggregate of parodies, fables, simple comparisons, character sketches, proverbs, and various rhetorical devices favored by the diatribe, combined with a great amount of spoudaiogeloion and with themes which are the commonplace, moralizing type favored by the Cynic-Stoic genre, forms a medley which may reflect the influences of the diatribal style upon the Roman poet. Lucilius did not write diatribes, but he, like the Hellenistic poets mentioned above, seems to have included within his poetry those traits of the diatribe which were compatible with his style and aims (cf. Fiske, op. cit.; Heinze, De Horatio. . . ; Puelma Piwonka, op. cit.; Van Rooy, op. cit.). Some of Lucilius' stylistic traits could have been drawn from other sources, as Chapter II has indicated, but the combination of so many of the major elements of the diatribe within his work does not seem to be a mere coincidence.

The influence of the diatribal tradition upon Roman republican literature is best illustrated, however, by the work of a poet who technically is not a satirist. In his didactic poem De rerum natura Lucretius has included a passage (III, 830-1094) which, because of its polemical tone and because of the presence of a virtual medley of all of the important traits belonging to the diatribal style, must be classed as a diatribe in poetic form. Chapter III of the present study, therefore, has discussed this passage in detail, since unlike the fragments of Ennius and Lucilius, it presents coherent evidence for the importance of the Cynic-Stoic tradition within Roman literature. This diatribe by Lucretius is concerned with destroying, through common-sense arguments, polemic, and ridicule, those wrong attitudes and opinions which produce the fear of death and make one's life unhappy. Beginning with an argument drawing an analogy between one's status in the time before one's birth and after one's death (cf. Bion's remark in the *Gnomologicum Vaticanum*, fr. 160) the poet next includes a section in which he ridicules the concern for the disposal of one's body after death. The use of *topoi* and a form of enumeration found within the fragments of Bion, the employment of an imaginary figure, and the presence of two tragic parodies are indicative of the diatribal nature of this particular attack (870-893) which displays a combination of polemicism and *spoudaiogeloion*. Following lines 870-893 appears another usage of an imaginary opponent whose views are reduced to absurdity by the poet through ridicule (894-911). A banqueting scene, perhaps reflecting a Bionean *topos* or else ridiculing only a commonplace theme, deals with the similarity between death and sleep and is followed by a long section which, in its use of two *prosopopoiiae* of *Natura*, is an obvious imitation of Bion's *prosopopoiia* of *Penia* (see Chapter III at footnote 55 ff.). The poet next attempts to give allegorical interpretation of several myths concerning famous malefactors who were allegedly punished after death (978-1028), and then employs his interlocutor once again, who delivers a sermon to himself, ridiculing his own desire to live when so many famous men have died. In the following section (1053-1075) appears a *characterismos* which is employed by the poet to illustrate the value of philosophy and the problems created by *mempsimoiria* (cf. Teles, p. 43.1 ff.; E. Fraenkel,

XUM

Horace, p. 92). A final concluding section provides a summary of several important points and ends with a *reductio ad absurdum* of another common opinion. From this brief summary of the content of III, 830-1094, it is evident that all of the important traits of the diatribe are found within the Lucretian passage, and that the combination of all of these allows one to class the passage as a diatribe in poetic form. One must stress again, further, that, although each of the traits and many of the themes which have been mentioned in the discussion conducted in Chapter III of the present study can be found in other genres or can be traced to nondiatribal sources, it is the union of these traits within a passage whose basic theme deals with a problem or topic concerned with the proper conduct of one's life and which employs a tone imbued with *spoudaiogeloion* and with polemic against human foolishness that permits the classification of Lucretius III, 830-1094 as a diatribe rather than as a purely didactic passage or as a *consolatio* directed toward the living.

This section of Lucretius' poem is but one of many which deserves consideration in terms of the influence of the diatribe upon the Roman poet. The *prooemia* to Books II and III seem to include sufficient traits of the genre to allow one to assume that the poet consciously employed the diatribal style in those passages, although one must hesitate to call them actual diatribes in poetic form. Further, the attack on love (in book IV, 1058-1287), various sections in the account of the rise of human civilization (V, 925-1457; cf. Waszink, "Zum Exkurs des Lukrez. . ."), and the polemic against a superstitious interpretation of the thunderbolt (VI, 379-422) deserve a future analysis in terms of the possible diatribal elements within them. The poet's use of myth also should be investigated in terms of the type of rationalization which he employs. Additionally, Lucretius' methods of argumentation are still in need of further analysis and should be considered from the point of view of rhetorical arguments and Epicurean induction. Authors and poets other than Lucretius, finally, offer ample material for future studies of the influence of the diatribe upon Greek and Roman literature, and special attention must be paid to those works of Philodemus which employ a diatribal style.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Texts and Commentaries

Aeschylus, ed. Denys Page, Oxford, 1972.

Alkaios, ed. Max Treu (Griechisch und Deutsch), München, 1952.

Aratus, ed. E. Maass, Teubner, rep. 1955.

Aristotle, Ars Rhetorica, ed. Adolph Roemer, Teubner, 1885.

________. Ars Rhetorica, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford, 1959.

________. Ars Rhetorica, ed. with commentary, E. M. Cope, rev. ed. J. E. Sandys, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1877.

________. Rhetoric, tr. W. Rhys Roberts, with an introduction by F. Solmsen, New York, 1954.

________. De Interpretatione, ed. L. Minio-Paluello, Oxford, 1949.

________. Topica et Sophistici Elenchi, ed. W. D. Ross, Oxford, 1958.

Athenaeus, ed. Georg Kaibel, Teubner, 1887.

Callimachus, ed. Rudolf Pfeiffer, 2 vols., Oxford, 1949 and 1953.

Campbell, David A., Greek Lyric Poetry, A selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry, New York, 1967.

Catullus, ed. with commentary by C. J. Fordyce, Oxford, 1961.

________. ed. with commentary by Wilhelm Kroll, Teubner, 3rd. ed., 1959.

Cicero, De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum, ed. Th. Schiche, Teubner, 1961.

______. De Inventione, ed. E. Stroebel, Teubner, rep. 1965.

______. De Officis, ed. C. Atzert, Teubner, 4th. ed., 1963.

______. Paradoxa Stoicorum, ed. O. Plasberg, Teubner, 1908.

______. Tusculanae Disputationes, ed. M. Pohlenz, Teubner, rep. 1965.

XUM

[Cicero], *Ad C. Herennium de Ratione Dicendi* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*), ed. Harry Caplan, Cambridge (Loeb), 1954.

________. *Incerti Auctoris de Ratione Dicendi ad C. Herennium Lib. IV*, ed. Friedrich Marx, ed. ster. corr. by Winfried Trillitzsch, Teubner, 1964.

Demetrius, ed. L. Radermacher, Teubner, rep. 1967.

Diogenes Laertius, ed. H. S. Long, Oxford, 1963.

Diogenes of Oenoanda, ed. C. W. Chilton, Teubner, 1967.

____________________. tr. with commentary by C. W. Chilton, Oxford, 1971.

Diels, Hermann (ed.), *Poetarum Philosophorum Fragmenta* (Poetarum Graecorum Fragmenta, III, part I), Berlin, 1901.

Empedocles, ed. J. Bollack, 3 vols., Paris, 1965 and 1969.

Ennius, ed. H. D. Jocelyn, Cambridge (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries), 1967.

______. ed. E. H. Warmington, in *Remains of Old Latin*, I, Cambridge (Loeb), 1961.

Epicurus, tr. and commentary by Graziano Arrighetti, Torino (Nuova Universale Einaudi 88), 1970.

________. ed. with tr. and commentary by Cyril Bailey, in *Epicurus, The Extant Remains*, Oxford, 1926.

________. ed. Hermann Usener, in *Epicurea*, Teubner, 1887.

Gow, A.S.F., and D. L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1965.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Synkrisis Bion*, ed. Heinrich M. Werhahn (Klassisch-Philologische Studien 15), Wiesbaden, 1953.

Halm, Carl, *Rhetores Latini Minores*, Teubner, rep. 1964.

Hermogenes, *Peri Methodou Deinotetos*, ed. H. Rabe, Teubner, rep. 1969.

Hesiod, ed. Friedrich Solmsen, Oxford, 1970.

Homer, *Iliad*, ed. David B. Monro and Thomas W. Allen, 2 vols., Oxford, 3rd. ed., rep. 1969.

_____. *Odyssey*, ed. P. von der Mühll, Basel, 1962.

XUM

Horace, ed. with commentary by Adolf Kiessling and Richard Heinze, vols. I (8th. ed., rep. 1955), II (7th. ed., rep. 1959), III (5th. ed., rep. 1957), Berlin.

______. ed. Friedrich Klingner, Teubner, 1959.

______. ed. with commentary by F. Plessis and P. Lejay, 3 vols., Paris, 1911.

Keller, O. (ed.), Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora, Teubner, rep. 1967.

Kirk, G. S., and J. E. Raven, The Presocratic Philosophers, A Critical History with a Selection of Texts, Cambridge, 1957.

Lucilius, ed. with German translation by Werner Krenkel, 2 vols., Leiden, 1970.

________. ed. F. C. Marx, 2 vols., Teubner, 1904-1905.

________. ed. E. H. Warmington, in Remains of Old Latin, III, Cambridge (Loeb), 1961.

Lucian, ed. F. Jacobitz, Teubner, 1867-1872.

Lucretius, ed. with commentary by Cyril Bailey, 3 vols., Oxford, 1947, rep. 1963.

_________. ed. Karl Büchner, Wiesbaden, 1966.

_________. Commentaire Exégetique et Critique, by Alfred Ernout and Léon Robin, 3 vols., Paris, 1925, 2nd. ed. 1962.

_________. Libri I-II, ed. with commentary by Carlo Giussani (Collezione di Classici Greci e Latini), rep. Torino, 1962.

_________. Libro V, ed. with commentary by C. Giussani and E. Stampini (Collezione di Classici Greci e Latini), Torino, 1972.

_________. Buch III, ed. with commentary by Richard Heinze (Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu Griechischen und Römischen Schriftstellern), Leipzig, 1897.

_________. Book III, ed. with commentary by E. J. Kenney (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics), Cambridge, 1971.

_________. ed. Joseph Martin, Teubner, 1963.

Mackail, J. W. (ed. and tr.), Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology, London, 1906.

XUM

Moschus, ed. A.S.F. Gow, in Bucolici Graeci, Oxford, rep. 1966.

Ovid, Tristium Libri Quinque, ed. S. G. Owen, Oxford, rep. 1963.

Page, D. L., Lyrica Graeca Selecta, Oxford, 1968.

Paulson, J., Index Lucretianus, Leipzig, 1926; rep. Darmstadt, 1970.

Philodemus, De Ira Liber, ed. C. Wilke, Teubner, 1914.

__________. De Morte, ed. D. Bassi, in Papiri Ercolanesi, I, Milan, 1914.

__________. De Morte, col. 37-39, ed. Marcello Gigante, in Richerche Filodemee (Biblioteca della Parola del Passato 6) Napoli, 1969.

__________. De Morte, ed. Siegfried Mekler, Wien, 1886.

__________. Peri Kakion Liber Decimus, ed. Christian Jensen, Teubner, 1911.

__________. Peri Parrhesias Libellus, ed. Alexander Olivieri, Teubner, 1914.

__________. Volumina Rhetorica, ed. Siegfried Sudhaus, 3 vols., Teubner, 1892-1896.

__________. The Rhetorica of Philodemus, tr. and commentary by Harry M. Hubbell, in Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 23 (1926) 243-382.

Phoinix of Kolophon, ed. with commentary by Gustav A. Gerhard, Teubner, 1909.

[Plato], Axiochus, ed. Joseph Souilhé, in Platon, Oeuvres Complètes, XIII, Paris, 1930.

Plautus, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols., Oxford, 1903.

Plutarch, Moralia, ed. Max Pohlenz, et al., Teubner, rep. 1971ff.

[Plutarch], Consolatio ad Apollonium, ed. J. Hani (Études et Commen. 78) Paris, 1972.

Quintilian, ed. L. Radermacher, 2nd. ed. with V. Buchheit, 2 vols., Teubner, 1959.

Sallust, Catilinae Coniuratio, ed. Adolph Kurfess, Teubner, 1968.

XUM

Seneca (Rhetor), Oratorum et Rhetorum Sententiae Divisiones Colores, ed. Adolph Kiessling, Teubner, rep. 1967.

Seneca, Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, ed. L. D. Reynolds, 2 vols., Oxford, 1965.

Servius, ed. Georg Thilo, I, Teubner, 1881.

Sophocles, ed. A. C. Pearson, Oxford, rep. 1967.

Spengel, L., Rhetores Graeci, 3 vols., Teubner, rep. 1966.

Sternbach, Leo (ed.), Gnomologicum Vaticanum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 743 (Texte und Kommentare, Eine Altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 2), Berlin, 1963.

Teles, ed. Otto Hense, Teubner, 2nd. ed. 1909, rep. 1969.

Terence, ed. with commentary by Sidney G. Ashmore, Oxford, 2nd. ed., rep. 1962.

Theocritus, ed. A.S.F. Gow, in Bucolici Graeci, Oxford, rep. 1966.

Theophrastus, Characteres, ed. Hermann Diels, Oxford, rep. 1952.

____________. Characteres, ed. with tr. by R. C. Jebb, 2nd. ed. by J. E. Sandys, London, 1909.

____________. ed. J. L. Ussing, Theophrasti Characteres et Philodemi de Vitiis liber decimus, Accedunt Characterismi duo ex Rutilio et ex Rhetoricis ad Herennium, Copenhagen, 1868.

Varro, De Lingua Latina, ed. Roland G. Kent, 2 vols. Cambridge (Loeb), 1967.

_____. Menippearum Reliquiae, ed. Franz Buechler, in Petronii Saturae et Liber Priapeorum, Berlin, 6th. ed., 1922.

_____. Saturarum Menippearum Reliquiae, ed. Alexander Riese, Teubner, 1865.

Vergil, ed. R.A.B. Mynors, Oxford, 1969.

Von Arnim, Hans, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, with indices by Maximilian Adler, 4 vols., Teubner, rep. 1968.

Vooys, C. J., Lexicon Philodemeum, I, Purmerend, 1934.

____________. Lexicon Philodemeum, II, ed. D.A. van Krevelen, Amsterdam, 1941.

XUM

Wehrli, Fritz (ed.), *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, *Text und Kommentar*, vols. VI and X, Basel, 2nd. ed., 1968.

B. Books and Articles

Abbott, F. F., "The Use of Repetition in Latin to Secure Emphasis, Intensity, and Distinctness of Impression," *Studies in Classical Philology*, 3 (1902), 67-87.

Alfonsi, Luigi, "Su Aristone di Ceo," *Aevum*, 31 (1957), 366-367.

Andrieu, J., *Le Dialogue Antique, Structure et Présentation*, (Collection d'Études Latines Publiée par la Société des Études Latines, Série Scientifique 29), Paris, 1954.

Arbusow, Leonid, *Colores Rhetorici, Eine Auswahl Rhetorischer Figuren und Gemeinplätze als Hilfsmittel für Übungen an mittelalterlichen Texten*, 2nd. ed. by Helmut Peter, Göttingen, 1963.

Arnold, E. V., *Roman Stoicism*, Cambridge, 1911.

Atkins, J.W.H., *Literary Criticism in Antiquity, A Sketch of its Development*, 2 vols., London, 1952.

Bailey, Cyril, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus*, Oxford, 1928.

____________. "The Mind of Lucretius," *American Journal of Philology*, 61 (1940), 278-291.

Baldwin, C. S., *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, Interpreted from Representative Works*, New York, 1924.

Bardon, Henri, *La Littérature Latine Inconnue, I, L'Époque Républicaine*, Paris, 1952.

Barker, Stephen F., *The Elements of Logic*, New York, 1965.

Barner, Wilfried, *Neuere Alkaios-Papyri aus Oxyrhynchos* (Spudasmata, Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten, XIV), Hildesheim, 1967.

Bayet, Jean, *Littérature Latine*, new ed. with Louis Nougaret (Collection U), Paris, 1965.

____________. "Lucrèce devant la Pensée Greque," *Mélanges de Littérature Latine* (Storia e Letteratura, Raccolta di Studi e Testi 110), Rome, 1967, pp. 11-26.

XUM

Bayet, Jean, "Études Lucretiennes," Mélanges de Littérature Latine (Storia e letteratura, Raccolta di Studi e Testi 110), Rome, 1967, pp. 27-84.

Becker, Oskar, Zwei Untersuchungen zur Antiken Logik (Klassisch-Philologische Studien 17) Wiesbaden, 1957.

Bergson, Henri, The Philosophy of Poetry: The Genius of Lucretius, ed. and tr. Wade Baskin, New York, 1959.

Bignone, Ettore, Empedocle, Studio Critico, Traduzione e Commento delle Testimazione e dei Frammenti (Studia Philologia I), Rome, rep. 1963.

______________. L'Aristotele Perduto e la Formazione Filosofica di Epicuro, 2 vols., Firenze, 1936.

______________. Storia della Letteratura Latina, 2 vols., Firenze, 1945.

Bocheński, I. M., Ancient Formal Logic (Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics), Amsterdam, 1951.

______________. A History of Formal Logic, tr. and ed. by Ivo Thomas, New York, 2nd. ed., 1970.

______________. La Logique de Théophraste (Collectanea Friburgensia, N.S., Fasc. 32), Fribourg, 1947.

Bolisani, Ettore, I logistorici Varroniani, Padova, 1937.

Bonner, S. F., Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire, Liverpool, 1969.

Boyancé, Pierre, "La connaissance du Grec à Rome," Revue des Études Latines, 34 (1956), 111-131.

______________. Lucrèce et L'Epicurisme (Les Grands Penseurs), Paris, 1963.

Brescia, Cesare, Richerche sulla Lingua e sulla Stile di Epicuro (Collana di Studi Greci 26), Naples, 1955.

Brink, K. O., "Peripatos," RE Supp. VII, 1947, col. 899-949.

Brochard, Victor, "Sur la logique des Stoïciens," Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, 5 (1892), 449-468.

XUM

Buchheit, Vincenz, "Homerparodie und Literarkritik," *Gymnasium*, 75 (1968), 519-553.

________________. *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon von Gorgias bis Aristotles*, München, 1960.

Büchner, Karl, *Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez*, Dissertation Leipzig, 1936.

____________. "Die Proömien des Lukrez," in *Lukrez und Vorklassik* (Studien zur Römischen Literatur, I), Wiesbaden, 1964.

____________. "Über den Aufbau von Beweisreihen im Lukrez," *Philologus*, 92 (1937), 68-82.

Bühler, Winfried, *Die Europa des Moschos, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (*Hermes*, Einzelschriften, 13), Wiesbaden, 1960.

Bultmann, R., *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt u. die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Forschungen zur Religion u. Kultur des Alten u. Neuen Test., 13), Göttingen, 1910.

Buresch, Carl, *Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque scriptarum historia critica* (Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie, 9), Leipzig, 1886.

Burgess, Theodore C., "Epideictic Literature," *Studies in Classical Philology*, 3 (1902), 89-261.

Canfora, Luciano, "Il Proemio del 'De Rerum Natura,'" *Belfagor*, *Rassegna di Varia Humanità*, 28 (1973), 161-167.

Capelle, W., "Diatribe," *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*, 3 (1957), col. 990-997.

Caplan, Harry (ed.), *Ad C. Herennium de Ratione Dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)*, Cambridge (Loeb), 1954.

Carcopino, Jerome, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, ed. Henry T. Rowell, tr. E. O. Lorimer, New Haven, rep. 1972.

Cardauns, Burkart, *Varros Logistorici über die Götterverehrung (Curio de cultu deorum), Ausgabe und Eklärung der Fragmente*, Dissertation Koln, 1958.

Cichorius, Conrad, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*, Berlin, 1908.

Clarke, M. L., "Cicero at School," *Greece and Rome*, 15 (1968) 18-22.

____________. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*, London, 1971.

XUM

Clarke, M. L., "Rhetorical Influences in the Aeneid," *Greece and Rome*, 18 (1949), 14-27.

____________. *Rhetoric at Rome, A Historical Survey*, London, 1953.

____________. "The *Thesis* in the Roman Rhetorical Schools of the Republic," *Classical Quarterly*, 1 (1951), 159ff.

Classen, C. J., "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc.*, 99 (1968), 77-118.

Clausen, Wendell, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 5 (1964), 181-196.

Clay, Diskin, "De Rerum Natura: Greek Physis and Epicurean Physiologia (Lucretius 1.1-148)," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc*., 100 (1969), 31-47.

Cobet, C. G., "Ad Philodemi librum X Περὶ κακιῶν et Theophrasti χαρακτῆρας ἠθικούς," *Mnemosyne*, N.S., 2 (1874), 28-72.

Coffey, Michael, "Die 'Saturae' des Ennius," in *Römische Satire*, (*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock*, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 15), 1966, 431-439.

Conte, G.-B., "Il'Trionfo della Morte'e la Galleria dei Grandi Trapassati in Lucrezio III 1024/1053" *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 37 (1965), 114-132.

____________. "῾ΤΣΟΣ e Diatriba nello Stile di Lucrezio," *Maia*, 18 (1966), 338-368.

Cope, E. M., *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric with Analysis, Notes, and Appendices*, London, 1897.

Copi, I. M., *Symbolic Logic*, New York, 3rd. ed., 1967.

Copleston, Frederick, *A History of Philosophy, Vol. I, Part II, Greece and Rome*, New York, 1962.

Couat, Auguste, *La Poésie Alexandrine sous les trois premiers Ptolémées (324-222 av. J.-C.)*, Paris, 1882.

Courtès, J.-M., "La dialectique du réel et du possible dans le De rerum natura de Lucrèce," *Revue des Études Latines*, 46 (1968), 170-179.

Cousin, J., "Lucrèce, les verseuses et la *vita stultorum* (de. nat. rer., III 1003 sq.)," *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à Alfred Ernout*, Paris, 1940, pp. 97-106.

Cox, A. S., "Lucretius and his Message, a Study in the Prologues of the De Rerum Natura," *Greece and Rome*, 18 (1971), 1-16.

Crönert, Wilhelm, *Kolotes und Menedemos, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Philosophen - und Literaturgeschichte* (Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde), Leipzig, 1906.

Croisille, J.-M., "Le sacrifice d'Iphigénie dans l'art romain et la littérature latine," *Latomus*, 22 (1967), 209-225.

Crook, J. A., *Law and Life of Rome* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life), Ithaca, 1967.

Dahlmann, Hellfried, "Bemerkungen zu Varros Menippea Tithonus, περὶ γήρως," in *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik*, ed. H. Dahlmann and Reinhold Merkelbach, Köln, 1959.

D'Alton, J. F., *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism, A Study in Tendencies*, London, 1931.

Daly, L. W., "Roman Study Abroad," *American Journal of Philology*, 71 (1950), 40ff.

Day, A. A., *The Origins of the Latin Love-Elegy*, Oxford, 1938.

DeLacy, P. H.", Lucretius and the History of Epicureanism," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc.*, 79 (1948), 12-23.

____________. "The Epicurean Analysis of Language," *American Journal of Philology*, 60 (1939), 85-92.

____________, and E. A. DeLacy (eds.), *Philodemus: On Methods of Inference, A Study in Ancient Empiricism* (Philological Monographs Published by the American Philological Assoc.), Philadelphia, 1941.

Della Corte, Francesco, *Varrone, il terzo gran lume romano*, Firenze, 2nd. ed., 1970.

Denniston, J. D., *Greek Prose Style*, Oxford, rep. 1965.

Desmouliez, A., "Cupidité, ambition et crainte de la mort chez Lucrèce (De R.N., III 59-93)," *Latomus*, 17 (1958), 317-323.

Deutsch, Rosamund E., The Pattern of Sound in Lucretius, Thesis Bryn Mawr, 1939.

Diels, Hermann, "Gorgias und Empedocles," in Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der Antiken Philosophie, ed. Walter Burkert, Hildesheim, 1969, pp. 159-184.

_____________. "Lukrezstudien I," In Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der Antiken Philosophie, ed. Walter Burkert, Hildesheim, 1969, pp. 312-339.

Dudley, D. R., A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century A. D., London, 1937.

___________. "The Satiric Element in Lucretius," in Lucretius, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London, 1965, pp. 115-130.

Dumézil, Georges, Archaic Roman Religion, tr. Philip Krapp, 2 vols., Chicago, 1970.

Dutoit, E., Le theme de l'adynaton dans la poésie antique, Paris, 1936.

Edelstein, Ludwig, "Primum Graius Homo (Lucretius I, 66)," Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc., 71 (1940), 78-90.

Esteve-Forriol, José, Die Trauer-und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur, Untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz, Dissertation Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, München, 1962.

Farrington, Benjamin, "Form and Purpose in the De Rerum Natura," in Lucretius, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London, 1965.

___________________. The Faith of Epicurus, London, 1967.

___________________. Science and Politics in the Ancient World, London, 1939.

Fehling, Detlev, Die Wiederholung und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias, Berlin, 1969.

Fern, Sr., Mary E., The Latin Consolatio as a Literary Type, rev. Dissertation, St. Louis University, 1941.

Festugière, A. J., Epicurus and his Gods, tr. C. W. Chilton, Oxford, 1955.

Fichtenau, Heinrich, "Rhetorische Elemente in der ottonisch-salischen Herrscherurkunde," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 68, 1960.

Fischel, Henry A., *Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy, A Study of Epicurea and Rhetorica in Early Midrashic Writings* (Studia Post-Biblica, 21), Leiden, 1973.

Fiske, G. C., *Lucilius and Horace, A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 7), Madison, 1920.

Fornara, C. W., "Sources of Plutarch's *An seni sit gerenda res publica*," *Philologus*, 110 (1966), 119-127.

Fraenkel, Eduard, *Horace*, Oxford, rep. 1966.

Fränkel, Hermann, *Ovid, A Poet between Two Worlds* (Sather Classical Lectures, 18), Berkeley, 1956.

Fraustadt, Georg, *De encomiorum in litteris Graecis usque ad Romanam aetatem historia*, Dissertation Leipzig, 1909.

Freymuth, Günther, *Zur Lehre von den Götterbildern in der Epikureischen Philosophie* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Veröffentlichung 2), Berlin, 1953.

Friedländer, Paul, "Das Proömium der Theogonie," in *Studien zur Antiken Literatur und Kunst*, Berlin, 1969, pp. 68-80.

———. "Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in Lucretius," in *Studien zur Antiken Literatur und Kunst*, Berlin, 1969, pp. 337-353.

———. "The Epicurean Theology in Lucretius' First Prooemium (Lucr. I, 44-49)," in *Studien zur Antiken Literatur und Kunst*, Berlin, 1969, pp. 328-336.

Furley, D. J., "Lucretius and the Stoics," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, University of London, 13 (1966), 13-33.

———. "Variations on Themes from Empedocles in Lucretius' Proem," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, University of London, 17 (1970), 55-64.

Geffcken, Johannes, *Kynika und Verwandtes*, Heidelberg, 1909.

Gercke, A., "Ariston," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 5 (1892), 198-216.

XUM

Giancotti, Francesco, *Il preludio di Lucrezio* (Biblioteca di Cultura Contemporanea, 63), Firenze, 1959.

Giangrande, Giuseppe, "Gli epigrammi alessandrini come arte allusiva," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 15 (1973), 7-31.

____________________. "Sympotic Literature and Epigram," in *Fondation Hardt Pour l'Étude de L'Antiquité Classique, Entretiens 14, L'Epigramme Grecque*, Genève, 1967, 93-174.

____________________. "The Utilization of Homeric Variants by Appolonius Rhodius: a Methodological Canon of Research," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 15 (1973), 73-81.

Giangrande, Lawrence, *The Use of Spoudaiogeloion in Greek and Roman Literature* (Studies in Classical Literature, 6), The Hague, 1972 (see chapter II, footnote 85, of the present study).

Giesecke, Alfred, "Der Stoiker Ariston von Chios," *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, ed. Alfred Fleckeisen, 145 (1892), 206-210.

Gigante, Marcello, *Richerche Philodemee*, Naples, 1969.

Gillis, D. J., "Pastoral Poetry in Lucretius," *Latomus*, 26 (1967), 339-362.

Giuffrida, Pasquale, *L'Epicureismo nella letteratura latina nel I secolo a.c.*, 2 vols., Torino, 1940.

Granarolo, Jean, *D'Ennius à Catulle, richerches sur les antécédents romains de la'poésie nouvelle'* (Collection d'Études Anciennes), Paris, 1971.

Grant, Mary A., *The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of the Laughable, The Greek Rhetoricians and Cicero* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 21), Madison, 1924.

Grimal, Pierre, "Lucrèce et son public," *Revue des Études Latines*, 41 (1963), 91-100.

Grimaldi, W.M.A., S. J., *Studies in the Philosophy of Aristotle's Rhetoric* (*Hermes*, Einzelschriften, 25), Wiesbaden, 1972.

Guillemin, A. M., *Le public et la vie littéraire à Rome* (Collection d'Études Latines), Paris, 1937.

Gwynn, Aubrey, S.J., Roman Education from Cicero to Quintillian, Oxford, 1926.

Härtke, Gundrun, Studien zur Exkurstechnik im römischen Lehrgedicht (Lukrez und Vergil) mit einem Anhang über Manilius, Dissertation Freiburg, 1936.

Haury, A., L'ironie et l'humour chez Cicéron (thesis Paris), Leiden, 1955.

Heinze, Richard, "Ariston von Chios bei Plutarch und Horaz," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, N.S. 45 (1890), 497-523.

_______________. De Horatio Bionis imitatore, Dissertation Bonn, 1889.

Helm, Rudolf, Lucian und Menipp, Leipzig, 1906.

Hendrickson, G. L., "Horace and Valerius Cato, Part III, The Neoteric Poets and the Latin Purists," Classical Philology, 13 (1917), 329-350.

_______________. "Satura-The Genesis of a Literary Form," Classical Philology, 61 (1911), 129-143.

Hense, Otto, "Ariston bei Plutarch," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 45 (1890), 541-554.

Herescu, N. I., La poésie latine, étude des structures phoniques, Paris, 1960.

Herter, Hans, "Die Soziologie der antiken Prostitution im Lichte des heidnischen und christlichen Schrifttums," Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, 3 (1960), 70-111.

_______________. "Zur Ersten Satire des Horaz," Rheinisches Museum, N.S. 94 (1951), 1-41.

Heurgon, Jacques, "Les éléments italiques dans la satire romaine," in Römische Satire (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 15), 1966, 431-439.

Hirzel, Rudolf, Der Dialog, Ein literarhistorischer Versuch, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1895.

Hoistad, Ragnar, Cynic Hero and Cynic King, dissertation Uppsala, 1948.

Howe, Herbert," Amafinius, Lucretius, and Cicero," American Journal of Philology, 72 (1951), 57-62.

XUM

Howell, W. S., "Rhetoric and Poetics: a Plea for the Recognition of the Two Literatures," in The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan, ed. Luitpold Wallach, Ithaca, 1966, pp. 374-390.

Hubbell, Harry M., "Isocrates and the Epicureans," Classical Philology, 11 (1916), 404ff.

Ingalls, W. B., "Repetition in Lucretius," Phoenix, 25 (1971), 227-236.

Jaeger, Werner, Aristotle, Fundamentals of the History of his Development, tr. Richard Robinson, Oxford, 2nd. ed., rep. 1967.

_____________. Paideia, The Ideals of Greek Culture, tr. Gilbert Highet, 3 vols., Oxford, 2nd. ed., 1965.

Jensen, Christian, "Ariston von Keos bei Philodem," Hermes, 46 (1911), 393-406.

_____________. "Zur Poetik des Stoikers Ariston von Chios," in Philodemus über die Gedichte, Fünftes Buch, ed. and tr., Berlin, 1923.

Jobst, Franz, Über das Verhältnis zwischen Lucretius und Empedocles, Dissertation Friedrich-Alexanders Universität, München, 1907.

Kenney, E. J., "Doctus Lucretius," Mnemosyne, ser. IV., 23 (1970), 366-392.

Kennedy, George, The Art of Persuasion in Greece, Princeton, 1963.

_____________. The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C. - A.D. 300, Princeton, 1972.

Kirkwood, G. M., Early Greek Monody, The History of a Poetic Type (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 37), Ithaca, 1974.

Klepl, Herta, Lukrez und Virgil in ihren Lehrgedichten, Vergleichende Interpretationen, Dissertation Leipzig, 1940, rep. Darmstadt, 1967.

Kneale, William, and Martha Kneale, The Development of Logic, Oxford, rep. 1964.

Knoche, Ulrich, Die Römische Satire, Göttingen, 1957.

Knögel, Wilhelm, Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, 5), Leipzig, 1933.

XUM

Körte, Alfred, "Augusteer bei Philodem," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 45 (1890), 172-177.

____________. Hellenistic Poetry, tr. Jacob Hammer and Moses Hadas, New York, 1929.

Kohl, Richard, De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis (Rhetorische Studien, 4), Paderborn, 1915.

Konstan, David, Some Aspects of Epicurean Psychology (Philosophia Antiqua, 25), Leiden, 1973.

Koster, Severin, Antike Epostheorien (Palingenesia, Monographien und Texte zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 5), Wiesbaden, 1970.

Kraetsch, Emil, De abundanti dicendi genere Lucretiano, Dissertation Berlin, 1881.

Kranz, Walther, "Lukrez und Empedocles," in Studien zur Antiken Literature und ihrem Fortwirken, Kleine Schriften, ed. Ernst Vogt (Bibliotek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, N.F. I, 3), Heidelberg, 1967.

Kroll, Wilhelm, Das Epicheirema (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch- historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 216, 2), Wien, 1936.

____________. "M. Tullius Cicero, Rhetorische Schriften," RE, VIIA, 19, col. 1091-1103.

____________. "Rhetorik," RE. Supp. VII, col. 1039-1138 (1947).

Kühnert, Friedmar, "'Ambitio' in der römischen Satire," in Römische Satire (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 15), 1966, 485-488.

Laffranque, Marie, Poseidonios d'Apamée, Essai de mise au point (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Paris, Série "Recherches," 13), Paris, 1964.

Landgraf, Gustav, "De figuris etymologicis linguae latinae," Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis, 2 (1881), 1-69.

Lattimore, Richmond, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs, Urbana, 1962.

Lausberg, Heinrich, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft, 2 vols., München, 1960.

Lavagnini, Bruno, "Motivi Diatribici in Lucrezio e in Giovenale," Athenaeum, N.S. 25 (1947), 83-88.

Lenkeit, Peter, Varros Menippea "Gerontodidaskalos," Dissertation, Köln, 1966.

Lesky, Albin, A History of Greek Literature, tr., James Willis and Cornelis de Heer, London, 1966.

Lesky, Erna, Die Zeugungs- und Vererbungslehren der Antike und ihr Nachwirken (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 19), Mainz, 1950.

Lukasiewicz, Jan, Aristotle's Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic, Oxford, 1951.

Maguiness, W. S., "The Language of Lucretius," in Lucretius, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London, 1965.

Mariotti, Italo, Studi Luciliani (Studi di Lettere Storia e Filosofia, Pubblicati dalla Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, 25), Firenze, 1960.

Marouzeau, J., "Pour mieux comprendre les textes latins (essai sur la distinction des styles)," Revue de Philologie, 45 (1921), 149-193.

__________. Traité de stylistique appliquée au Latin (Collection D'Études Latines publiee par la Société des Études Latines, 12), Paris, 1935.

Marrou, H. I., A History of Education in Antiquity, tr. George Lamb, New York, rep. 1964.

Martha, Constant, Le Poëme de Lucrèce, Morale-religion-science, Paris, 4th. ed., 1885.

Martyn, J.R.C., "Imagery in Lucilius," in Römische Satire (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 15), 1966, 493-504.

Mates, Benson, Stoic Logic (University of California Publications in Philosophy, 26), Berkeley, 1953.

Mayer, August, "Aristonstudien," Philologus, Supp. 11 (1908-1910), 485-610.

XUM

McKeon, Richard, "The Methods of Rhetoric and Philosophy: Invention and Judgement," The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan, ed. Luitpold Wallach, Ithaca, 1966, pp. 365-373.

Mendell, C. W., Latin Poetry, The New Poets and the Augustans, New Haven, 1965.

____________. "Satire as Popular Philosophy," Classical Philology, 15 (1920), 138-157.

Merbach, F., De Epicuri canonica, Dissertation Leipzig, 1909.

Merlan, Philip, Studies in Epicurus and Aristotle (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, 22) Wiesbaden, 1960.

Milobenski, Ernst, Der Neid in der Griechischen Philosophie (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, 29), Wiesbaden, 1964.

Minadeo, Richard, The Lyre of Science, Form and Meaning in Lucretius' De Rerum Natura, Detroit, 1969.

Moreau, Joseph, "Ariston et le Stoicisme," Revue des Études Anciennes, 50 (1948), 27-48.

Müller, Gerhard, Die Darstellung der Kinetik bei Lukrez (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 7), Berlin, 1959.

____________. "Die Problematik des Lukreztextes seit Lachmann," Philologus, 102 (1958), 247-283; 103 (1959), 53-86.

Murley, Clyde, "Lucretius and the History of Satire," Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc., 70 (1939), 380-395.

____________. "Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, Viewed as Epic," Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Assoc., 78 (1947), 336-346.

Murray, Oswyn, "Philodemus on the Good King According to Homer," Journal of Roman Studies, 55 (1965), 161-182.

Mussehl, Joachim, De Lucretiani libri primi condicione ac retractione, Thesis Gryphiswald, 1912.

Nøjgaard, Morten, La Fable Antique, I, La Fable Grecque avant Phèdre, Copenhagen, 1964.

Norden, Eduard, *Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig, 1913.

————. *Die Antike Kunstprosa, von VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1909.

————. *In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae* (Commentatio ex supplementis annalium philologicorum seorsum expressa), Leipzig, 1891.

Ogle, M. B., "Horace, an Atticist," *Classical Philology*, 11 (1916), 156-158.

Oltramare, André, *Les Origines de la diatribe romaine*, Lausanne, 1926.

Otis, Brooks, *Virgil, A Study in Civilized Poetry*, Oxford, rep. 1966.

Otto, A., *Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer, Gesammelt und Erklärt*, Hildesheim, rep. 1971.

Owen, W. H., "Structural Patterns in Lucretius' De Rerum Natura I," *Classical World*, 62 (1968), 121-127.

Perret, Jacques, *Horace*, tr. Bertha Humez, New York, 1964.

————. "L'amour de l'argent, l'ambition et la crainte de la morte (Lucrèce III 59-86)," in *Mélanges. . .offerts à Alfred Ernout*, Paris, 1940, pp. 277-284.

Perry, B. E., *Aesopica*, 2 vols., Urbana, 1952.

————. *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop*, Haverford, 1936.

Pfligersdorffer, Georg, *Studien zu Poseidonios* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch- Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 232, vol. 5), Wien, 1959.

Phillipson, Robert, Review of André Oltramare, *Les Origines de la diatribe romaine*, *Gnomon*, 3 (1927), 727-729.

————. Review of Jacob van Wageningen, *De Ciceronis libro consolationis* (Groningen, 1916), *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 37 (1917), 495-503.

Pohlenz, Maximilian, *De Posidonii libris Περὶ Παθῶν* (commentatio ex supplemento vicesimo quarto annalium philologicorum seorsum expressa), Leipzig, 1898.

Pohlenz, Maximilian, *Die Stoa, Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1948.

__________________. Review of Johannes Geffcken, *Kynica und Verwandtes* (Heidelberg, 1909), and of George Büttner, *Basileos des Grossen Mahnworte an die Jugend* (Würzburger Dissertation, 1908, München), *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 31 (1911), 176-182.

__________________. *Τὸ πρέπον, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes* (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch- Historische Klasse, Fachfgruppe I, 16), Berlin, 1933, 53-92.

Poteat, H. M., *Repetition in Latin Poetry with Special Reference to the Metrical Treatment of Repeated Words*, Dissertation Columbia University, New York, 1912.

Prior, A. N., *Formal Logic*, Oxford, 2nd. ed., 1962.

Puelma Piwonka, Mario, *Lucilius und Kallimachos, Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch- römischen Poesie*, Frankfurt am Main, 1949.

Radermacher, Ludwig, *Weinen und Lachen, Studien über antikes Lebensgefühl*, Wien, 1947.

Rahn, Helmut, *Morphologie der antiken Literatur, Eine Einführung* (Die Altertumswissenschaft, Einführungen in Gegenstand, Methoden und Ergebnisse ihrer Teildisziplinen und Hilfswissenschaften), Darmstadt, 1969.

Rambaud, Michel, *Cicéron et l'histoire romaine* (Collection d'études latines, Série scientifique, 28), Paris, 1953.

Rand, E. K., "La composition rhétoric du IIIe livre de Lucrèce," *Revue de Philologie*, 60 (1934), 243-266.

Regenbogen, Otto, "Lukrez, Seine Gestalt in seinem Gedicht," in *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Franz Dirlmeier, München, 1961, pp. 296-386.

__________________. "Theophrastus," *RE Supp*. VII, 1947, col. 1354-1562.

Reichel, Georg, *Quaestiones Progymnasticae*, Leipzig, 1909.

Reitzenstein, Erich, *Theophrast bei Epikur und Lukrez* (Orient und Antike), Heidelberg, 1924.

XUM

Rist, J. M., Epicurus, An Introduction, Cambridge, 1972.

__________. Stoic Philosophy, Cambridge, 1969.

Ritschl, Friedrich, "Aristo der Peripatetiker bei Cicero de Senectute," in Kleine Philologische Schriften, I, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 551-559.

Robin, Léon, La Pensée grecque et les origines de l'esprit scientifique (L'Évolution de l'humanité, Bibliothèque de synthèse historique, 13), Paris, 1963.

Rösler, Wolfgang, "Lukrez und die Vorsokratiker, Doxographische Probleme im I. Buch von 'De Rerum Natura,'" Hermes, 101 (1973), 48-64.

Rose, H. G., A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the Age of Lucian, New York, rep. 1960.

__________. A Handbook of Latin Literature from the Earliest Times to the Death of St. Augustine, New York, rep. 1960.

Ross, W. D., Aristotle, New York, rep. 1956.

Rostagni, Augusto,"L'elegia erotica latina e i modelli greci," Scritti Minore, II, 2, Romana, Torino, 1956.

__________. "Partenio di Nicea, Elvio Cinna e i 'poetae novi,'" Scritti Minore, II, 2, Romana, Torino, 1956.

__________. Poeti Alessandrini, Torino, rep. 1963.

Ruch, Michel, Le préambule dans les oeuvres philosophiques de Cicéron, Essai sur la genèse et l'art du dialogue (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Fasc. 136), Paris, 1958.

Rudd, Niall, "Horace, Satires 1.6," Phoenix, 15 (1961), 196-212.

Saint-Denis, E., Essais sur le rire et le sourire des Latins (Publications de l'Université de Dijon, 30), Paris, 1965.

__________. Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine, Paris, 1935.

Sambursky, S., The Physical World of the Greeks, tr. Merton Dagut, New York, 1962.

Sayre, Farrand, Diogenes of Sinope, A Study of Greek Cynicism, Baltimore, 1938.

Schenkeveld, D. M., "OI KPITIKOI in Philodemus," Mnemosyne, 21 (1968), 176-214.

Scarpat, Giuseppe, Parrhesia, Storia del termine e delle sue traduzioni in Latino, Brescia, 1964.

Schmid, Wolfgang, "Epikur," Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, 5 (1963), col. 681-819.

Schmidt, E. G., "Diatribai," Der Kleine Pauly, II, Stuttgart, 1967, col. 1577-1578.

_____________. "Diatribe und Satire," in Römische Satire (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 15), 1966, 507-515.

Schrijvers, P. H., Horror ac divina voluptas, Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce, Amsterdam, 1970.

Sellar, W. Y., The Roman Poets of the Republic, Oxford, re-issue of the 3rd. ed., 1905.

Shorey, Paul, "Plato, Lucretius, and Epicurus," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 12 (1901), 201-210.

Sikes, E. E., Lucretius, Poet and Philosopher, Cambridge, 1936.

Smiley, C. N., Latinitas and ʽΕλληνισμός, Dissertation University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1906.

Smith, M. F., "Some Lucretian Thought Processes," Hermathena, 102 (1966), 73-83.

Solmsen, Friedrich, "Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings," Kleine Schriften, II, Hildesheim, 1968, pp. 216-230.

_________________. "Epicurus and Cosmological Heresies," Kleine Schriften, I, Hildesheim, 1968, pp. 461-483.

_________________. "Epicurus on the Growth and Decline of the Cosmos," Kleine Schriften, I, Hildesheim, 1968, pp. 484-501.

_________________. "Love and Strife in Empedocles' Cosmology," Kleine Schriften, I, 1968, pp. 274-313.

_________________. "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric," Kleine Schriften, II, Hildesheim, 1968, pp. 178-215.

Sonnenburg, P. E., "De Lucreti proemiis," Rheinisches Museum, 62 (1907), 33ff.

XUM

Spangenberg, C.H.J., *De Lucreti tropis*, Dissertation Marburg, 1881.

Steckel, Horst, "Epikuros," *RE Supp*. XI (Stuttgart, 1968), col. 579-652.

Stevens, E. B., "Topics of Pity in the Poetry of the Roman Republic," *American Journal of Philology*, 62 (1941), 426-440.

Stocks, J. L., "Epicurean Induction," *Mind*, 34 (1925), 185-203.

Stork, Traudel, *Nil Igitur Mors est ad Nos, Der Schlussteil des dritten Lukrezbuchs und sein Verhältnis zur Konsolationsliteratur*, Bonn, 1970.

Stroux, J., "Die stoische Beurteilung Alexanders des Grossen," *Philologus*, 88 (N.S. 42), 1933, 222-240.

Suerbaum, Werner, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter, Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius* (Spudasmata, Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten, 19), Hildesheim, 1968.

Susemihl, Franz, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1891.

Szantyr, Anton (ed.), *Lateinische Grammatik*, II, *Syntax und Stylistik*, by M. Leumann and J. B. Hofmann, 1965; verb. Nachdruck, 1972.

Terzaghi, Nicola, *Lucilio* (Studia Philologica, 14), Rome, rep. 1970.

Throm, Hermann, *Die Thesis, Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte* (Rhetorische Studien, 17), Paderborn, 1932.

Townend, G. B., "Imagery in Lucretius," in *Lucretius*, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London, 1965, 95-114.

______________. "The Poems," in *Cicero*, ed. T. A. Dorey (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London, 1964, 109-134.

Traglia, Anton, *De Lucretiano sermone ad philosophiam pertinente* (Quaderni Gismondi, Serie Convivum, 7), Roma, 1947.

Ullman, B. L., "Satura and Satire," *Classical Philology*, 8 (1913), 172-194.

Vahlen, H., "Uber das Prooemium des Lucretius," in *Gesammelte Philologische Schriften, Zweiter Teil, Schriften der Berliner Zeit*, 1874-1911, pp. 12-31.

XUM

Vallette, P., "Lucrèce et la diatribe," *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 42 (1940), 532-541.

Van Geytenbeek, A. C., *Musonius Rufus and Greek Diatribe*, tr. B. L. Hijmans, Jr. (Wijsgerige Teksten en Studies, 8), Assen, rev. ed. 1963.

Van Groningen, B. A., *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque, Procédés et réalisations* (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.S. 65, 2), Amsterdam, 1958.

————————. *La poésie verbale grecque, Essai de mise au point* (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 16, 4), Amsterdam, 1953.

Van Rooy, C. A., *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*, Leiden, 1966.

Van Straaten, Modestus, *Panaetius, sa vie, ses écrits et sa doctrine avec une édition des fragments*, Amsterdam, 1946.

Vlastos, Gregory, "Zeno of Sidon as a Critic of Euclid," in *The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. Luitpold Wallach, Ithaca, 1966.

Von Arnim, Hans, "Bion," *RE* III, 1 (1897), col. 483-485.

Von Mueller, Heinrich, *De Teletis elocutione*, Dissertation Freiburg, 1891.

Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Philologische Untersuchungen, ed. A. Kiessling und U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 4), Berlin, 1881.

————————. *Die Griechische Literatur des Altertums*, in *Die Lateinische Literatur und Sprache* (Die Kultur der Gegenwart, I, 8), Leipzig, 1912.

————————. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1924.

Wallach, Luitpold, "A Palestinian Polemic against Idolatry, A Study in Rabbinic Literary Forms," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 19 (1945-1946), 389-404.

———————— (ed.), *The Classical Tradition, Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, Ithaca, 1966.

Waltz, René, "Lucrèce Satirique," *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé, Supplement: Lettres d'Humanite*, 8 (1949), 78-103.

__________. "Lucrèce dans Lucrèce," *Bulletin de L'Association Guillaume Budé, Supplement: Lettres d'Humanité,* 12 (1953), 43-63.

Waszink, J. H., "Lucretius and Poetry," *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 17, 8, Amsterdam (1954), 243-257.

__________. "Zum Excurs des Lukrez über Glaube und Aberglaube (V 1194-1240)," *Wiener Studien*, 79 (1966), 308-313.

__________. "Zur Ersten Satire des Lucilius," *Wiener Studien*, 70 (1957), 322-328.

Wehrli, F., "Ariston von Iulis auf Keos," *RE Supp*. 11 (Stuttgart, 1968), col. 156-159.

Webster, T.B.L., "The Comedy of Menander," in *Roman Drama*, ed. T. A. Dorey and D. L. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London, 1965, pp. 1-20.

Wendland, Paul and Otto Kern, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie und Religion,* Berlin, 1895.

West, David, *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*, Edinburgh, 1969.

__________. "Virgilian Multiple-Correspondence Similes and their Antecedents," *Philologus*, 114 (1970), 262-275.

Widmann, Hans, *Beiträge zur Syntax Epikurs* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 24), Stuttgart, 1935.

Wiemken, Helmut, *Der griechische Mimus, Dokumente zur Geschichte des Volkstheaters*, Bremen, 1972.

Wildenow, Eugenius, *De Menippo Cynico*, Dissertation Halle, 1881.

Wilkinson, L. P., *Ovid Surveyed*, Cambridge, 1962.

__________. "Philodemus and Poetry," *Greece and Rome*, 2 (1933), 144-151.

Wimmel, Walter, *Kallimachos in Rom, Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit* (Hermes, Einzelschriften, 16), Wiesbaden, 1960.

XUM

Wimmel, Walter, Zur Form der Horazischen Diatribensatire, Frankfurt am Main, 1962.

Wiśniewski, Bohdan, "L'Influence des Sophistes sur Aristotle, Epicure, Stoïciens et Sceptiques," Komitet Nauk O Kulturze Antyczny Polskiez Akademii Nauk, Archiwum Filologiczne, 13, 1966.

Wissowa, Georg, Religion und Kultus der Römer (Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft), München, 1902.

Wistrand, E., "De Lucreti prooemii interpretatione," Eranos, 1943, pp. 43ff.

Witke, Charles, Latin Satire, The Structure of Persuasion, Leiden, 1970.

Woltjer, Jan, Lucreti philosophia cum fontibus comparata, Dissertation Groningen, 1877.

____________. "Studia Lucretiana," Mnemosyne, 24 (1896), 62-71.

Woodhead, William D., Etymologizing in Greek Literature from Homer to Philo Judaeus, Dissertation Chicago, 1928.

Wormell, D.E.W., "Lucretius: The Personality of the Poet," Greece and Rome, 1962, pp. 54-65.

____________. "The Personal World of Lucretius," in Lucretius, ed. D. R. Dudley (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence), London, 1965.

Woytek, Erich, Sprachliche Studien zur Satura Menippea Varros (Wiener Studien, Beiheft 2), Wien, 1970.

____________. "Stilistische Untersuchungen zur Satura Menippea Varros," Eranos, 70 (1972).

C. Supplementary Bibliography

Allen, Walter, Jr., and Phillip DeLacy, "The Patrons of Philodemus," Classical Philology, 34 (1938), 59-65.

Bailey, Cyril, "Late Republican Poetry: Lucretius," with an appendix by D.E.W. Wormell, in Fifty Years and Twelve of Classical Scholarship, ed. M. Platnauer, New York, 1967.

Boyancé, Pierre, "Lucrèce et la poesie," Revue des Études Anciennes, 49 (1947), 88-102.

______________. "Lucrèce et son disciple," Revue des Études Anciennes, 52 (1950), 212 ff.

Brieger, A., "Bericht über die Litteratur zu Lucretius, die Jahre 1880-1881 umfassend," Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen altertumswissenschaft, ed. Conrad Bursian, 27, Berlin, 1881, 147-146.

Collart, Jean, Varron grammairien latin (Publications de la Faculté des l'Université de Strasbourg, 121), Paris, 1954.

Conrad, C. W., "Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 69 (1965), 195-258.

Dawson, C. W., "The Iambi of Callimachus, A Hellenistic Poet's Experimental Laboratory," Yale Classical Studies, 11 (1950, 1 ff.

Deubner, L., "Die Saturae des Ennius und die Iamben des Kallimachos," Rheinisches Museum, 96 (1953), 289 ff.

Grube, G.M.A., The Greek and Roman Critics, London, 1965.

Hendrickson, G. L., "The Provenance of Jerome's Catalogue of Varro's Works," Classical Philology, 6 (1911), 334 ff.

Hense, Otto, "Bion bei Philon," Rheinisches Museum N. S., 47 (1892), 219-240.

___________. "Ariston von Plutarch," Rheinisches Museum N. S., 45 (1890), 541-554.

Hudson-Williams, H. L., "Conventional Forms of Debate and the Melian Dialogue," American Journal of Philology, 71 (1950), 156 ff.

Jacoby, F., "Das Prooemium des Lucretius," Hermes 56 (1921), 1-65.

Judge, Edwin A., "Saint Paul and Classical Society," Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, 15 (1972), 19-36.

Leo, F., "Varro und die Satire," Hermes, 24 (1889), 67 ff.

Martin, Victor, "Un recueil de diatribes cyniques Pap. Genèv. inv. 271," Museum Helveticum, 16 (1959), 77-115.

Michels, A. K., "παρρησία and the Satire of Horace," *Classical Philology* 39 (1944), 173-177.

Modrze, Annelise, "Teles," *RE*, Ser. 2, 5A part I, 1934, col. 375-382.

Perelli, Luciano, *Lucrezio, Pocta dell' agnoscia* (Biblioteca di Cultura, *85)*, Firenze, 1869.

Photiades, Pénélope, "Les diatribes cyniques du papyrus de Genève 271, leurs traductions et elaborations successives," *Museum* Helveticum, 16 (1959), 116-139.

Ritschl, Friedrich, "Die Schriftstellerei des M. Terentius Varro," in *Kleine Philologische Schriften*, III, Leipzig, 1866, 418 ff.

Traglia, Antonio, *Sulla formazione spirituale di Lucrezio*, Roma, 1948.

Untersteiner, Mario, *The Sophists*, tr. Kathleen Freeman, Cambridge, 1954.

Varron, *Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité Classique*, *Entretiens IX*, Genève, 1962.

Waszink, J. H., "Tradition and Personal Achievement in Early Latin Literature," *Mnemosyne*, ser. iv, 13 (1960), 16 ff.

XUM

VITA

Barbara Price Wallach was born on August 31, 1946, in Roanoke, Virginia, to the Rev. and Mrs. Benjamin T. Price. After attending elementary and junior high schools in various areas of Virginia she graduated from Douglas S. Freeman High School in Henrico County, Virginia, in June, 1964. She entered Mary Washington College at Fredericksburg, Virginia, in September, 1964, majoring in Latin with a Greek minor, and graduated in June, 1968, with a Bachelor of Arts degree with final honors and with honors in Latin, after completing student teaching and an honors paper directed by Prof. L. V. Sumner on the topic "Vergil and the Augustan Revival of Roman Religion." After being awarded a Doctoral Support Grant by the University of Illinois she began her graduate studies in classics at that institution and received her Master of Arts degree in Classics in February, 1970. She married Prof. Luitpold Wallach on August 22, 1970. Continuing her graduate work she completed the written and oral preliminary Ph.D. examinations in May, 1972. She was elected to Phi Kappa Phi in September, 1972. Mrs. Wallach held two university fellowships (1968-1969 and 1972-1973) and a research assistantship (1973-1974); she taught, as a teaching assistant at the university for three years (1969-1972), courses in elementary Latin (102), Catullus and Ovid (104), and the humanities (with special emphasis on tragedy). In the course of her graduate work she studied with Professors Kenneth Abbott, Miroslav Marcovich, J. K. Newman, R. P. Oliver, Chester Starr, Daniel Taylor, and Luitpold Wallach. She intends

XUM

to pursue a career of teaching and research in Greek and Latin literature with special emphasis on rhetoric and ancient literary criticism.